

Another bill, H.R. 14063, would include prescription drugs among the medical expenses covered under the medicare supplementary benefit plan.

The Nation's indigent and elderly population should not be called upon to bear the uneven brunt of inflation. As a priority, Congress must insure that medicine and health care are not priced beyond the reach of those who need it most.

The Right Reverend Monsignor Frederick G. Hochwalt, 1909-66

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HUGH L. CAREY

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, September 13, 1966

Mr. CAREY. Mr. Speaker, on September 5, the Right Reverend Monsignor Frederick G. Hochwalt, secretary general of the U.S. National Catholic Educational Association and former director of the National Catholic Welfare Conference's Education Department, died aboard a ship en route to Venice.

Monsignor Hochwalt was the proverbial man of many parts: educator, administrator, innovator, polemicist, and advocate.

To all his roles he brought an urbanity that disarmed more than one opponent and made him one of the best known and liked figures on the national educational scene.

As secretary general of the National Catholic Educational Association and, for nearly 22 years, director of the Education Department of the National Catholic Welfare Conference, he was called on repeatedly to act as spokesman for Catholic schools in a time of epochal change.

On many occasions he defended the rights of Catholic schools and their students before congressional committees. He was closely identified with the long battle to win equal treatment for non-public education in Federal aid programs.

He constantly supported efforts to improve the performance of Catholic schools. Typically, he was one of the directors of the recent University of Notre Dame study of Catholic education, a massive effort to uncover the facts about Catholic schools as an essential preliminary to making them better.

One of his last public statements was a call to innovation in order that Catholic schools could meet new needs and changing times more effectively. In the introduction to an NCEA booklet, "Support Programs and the Private School," he recommended dropping the traditional parochial approach to financing parochial schools which relies on tuition, individual contributions and drives in favor of more professional, better organized efforts.

The keystone of his career was conviction that nonpublic schools are needed to preserve the dual structure—public and private—of American education and thus respect the realities of a pluralistic society.

Coupled with this was a commitment to the rights of the Nation's 5.5 million parochial school students, both for their own sakes and for the well-being of the country.

If Congress concludes that the educational standards of the country demand an upgrading and that this must come about by Federal aid and encouragement—

He told a Senate subcommittee in June 1963—

then the general welfare of the country and the national interest dictate that all children receive this help and encouragement.

He resigned in January of this year as director of the NCWC Education Department after having been in poor health for some time. Msgr. James C. Donohue, his successor, commented then that it was "the measure of his genius that he saw the need for change and was its catalyst, that he planned for development and was its inspiration."

Born in Dayton, Ohio, February 25, 1909, he attended Catholic schools and received his B.A. from the University of Dayton in 1931. He was ordained in 1935 and later received an M.A. and Ph.D. in educational administration from the Catholic University of America.

After holding several posts in the Cincinnati archdiocese, including assistant superintendent of schools, he was named to his position with the NCEA and NCWC in 1944, succeeding the late Msgr. George Johnson, under whom he had studied at the Catholic University.

His role as spokesman for Catholic education began early as the debate over Federal aid to education and the inclusion of Catholic schools in aid programs got underway in earnest after the war.

At a stormy session of the American Association of School Administrators 1947 convention in Atlantic City, for example, a professor from Columbia University Teachers College accused Catho-

lics of blocking Federal aid to public schools by uniting with "reactionary and financially selfish groups" until their own schools were included in the proposed Federal program.

Monsignor Hochwalt hit back by accusing opponents of aid to parochial schools of a very negative and obstructionist attitude. He also denied that aiding nonpublic schools would hurt public schools.

He said:

On the contrary, a strong complementary system of education should prove the greatest incentive to public education.

The battle over Federal aid waxed and waned over the next decade and a half, and Monsignor Hochwalt was in the thick of the controversy.

When, in January 1963, Congress held hearings on a Federal-aid program that would have excluded church-related elementary and secondary schools, Monsignor Hochwalt said:

It contains something for everybody, everybody except the children whose parents have elected to send them to private schools.

By excluding children in church-related schools, he said, the program ignores one child in seven. He added that—

Any proposal of a pattern of discriminatory legislation that disregards such a rich educational resource cannot be called balanced nor can it be considered truly in the national interest.

The Federal-aid debate was resolved, at least temporarily, by the enactment, in 1965, of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act, which includes non-public-school children in its major programs. The act incorporates the "child benefit" principle for aiding such pupils.

Monsignor Hochwalt urged that all concerned help to make the program work.

He said:

Educators—and I mean those in public and parochial school systems—are going to have to make a concerted effort to see how this provision can be successful.

Holder of honorary degrees from a dozen colleges and universities and of numerous other awards, Monsignor Hochwalt served on many government and private education commissions.

Summing up his career at the time of his retirement from his NCWC post in January, Monsignor Donohue commented:

As a spokesman for Catholic education for two decades he presented the case for Christian education professionally, with great dignity, realistically and, perhaps most important of all, optimistically. No one else could have done it as well.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

WEDNESDAY, SEPTEMBER 14, 1966

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

The Chaplain, Rev. Edward G. Latch, D.D., offered the following prayer:

Behold, God is my salvation, I will trust and not be afraid.—Isaiah 12: 2.

Almighty God, Father of all mankind, whom to know is life eternal, whom to

love is life glorified and whom to serve is life filled to the full, in spirit and in truth we bow before this altar of prayer offering unto Thee once again the devotion of our hearts. Some of our number are celebrating the coming of another new year—may they and we enter it in the power of Thy spirit. We acknowledge that in days past we have done what we ought not to have done and we have not done what we ought to have done. We

have had opportunity to forward Thy spirit of good will among men and we have fallen by the way. Forgive us, O God, and renew a right and a good spirit within us—that this year may witness a renewed purpose to struggle for the right in church and city and country that poverty and violence and misunderstanding may disappear, and that justice and peace and understanding may appear in our Nation and in our own hearts. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

The Journal of the proceedings of yesterday was read and approved.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate by Mr. Arrington, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate had passed without amendment a bill of the House of the following title:

H.R. 13508. An act to direct the Secretary of the Interior to cooperate with the States of New York and New Jersey on a program to develop, preserve, and restore the resources of the Hudson River and its shores and to authorize certain necessary steps to be taken to protect those resources from adverse Federal actions until the States and Congress shall have had an opportunity to act on that program.

The message also announced that the Senate had passed, with amendments in which the concurrence of the House is requested, bills of the House of the following titles:

H.R. 11979. An act to make permanent the act of May 22, 1965, authorizing the payment of special allowances to dependents of members of the uniformed services to offset expenses incident to their evacuation, and for other purposes; and

H.R. 15005. An act to amend title 10, United States Code, to remove inequities in the active duty promotion opportunities of certain officers.

The message also announced that the Senate disagrees to the amendments of the House to the bill (S. 3467) entitled "An act to amend the National School Lunch Act, as amended, to strengthen and expand food service programs for children," requests a conference with the House on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon and appoints Mr. ELLENDER, Mr. HOLLAND, Mr. TALMADGE, Mr. JORDAN of North Carolina, Mr. MCGOVERN, Mr. AIKEN, Mr. YOUNG of North Dakota, and Mr. COOPER to be the conferees on the part of the Senate.

TEACHERS EDUCATIONAL EXPENSES—AMENDMENT

Mr. ADAMS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Washington?

There was no objection.

Mr. ADAMS. Mr. Speaker, yesterday I introduced H.R. 17671 to provide that teachers in our schools and colleges may deduct from their income tax those expenses incurred in improving their educational competency.

Since 1958 it has been the stated policy of the Internal Revenue Service to permit deductions of such expenses. However, the variety of interpretations of the IRS regulations on this matter have caused many problems. As a result of this uncertainty, teachers have been discouraged in many instances from pursuing programs of self-improvement. I know the problem has been a serious one in my home State of Washington.

To further confuse the issue, IRS now proposes, according to the Federal Register of July 7, 1966, new regulations which will be even more confusing. As the situation stands, IRS agents are, in fact, making educational decisions which they are not competent to make.

Mr. Speaker, my bill, which is identical to H.R. 17172 by the Honorable CECIL KING, of California, the distinguished ranking majority member of the House Ways and Means Committee, will correct the confusion that presently exists and, by congressional directive, mandate IRS to treat teachers equitably. It is of special importance at this time because of the teacher shortage that exists in this country. My State of Washington has teacher certification standards second to none in the Nation—a fact of which I am duly proud. But we know that we will have to recruit people into teaching who have not met these modern standards. If such persons can continue their education on the job, and be encouraged to do so by a sensible Federal tax policy such as my bill proposes, this will be of great benefit to the children they are to teach. Thus, this is truly an education bill and one which deserves the immediate attention of the 89th Congress which has rightly been called the education Congress.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

Mr. MOORHEAD. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

Mr. MOORHEAD. Mr. Speaker, I request that our colleague, the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. HOLLAND], be excused from attendance upon the House today, because of virtually the only thing that could keep him away. I am delighted, Mr. Speaker, to be able to announce to the House that our friend and colleague from Pennsylvania has this morning become a grandfather. The new member of the Holland clan, and I trust, the Democratic Party, is Mr. Christopher Joseph Hoveland, born this morning to Mr. and Mrs. William A. Hoveland. Mrs. Hoveland, the daughter of Congressman and Mrs. HOLLAND, is doing splendidly at Bethesda Naval Hospital, where the proud father is stationed as a member of the U.S. Navy. I am sure that I speak for us all, Mr. Speaker, in extending congratulations to Mr. and Mrs. Hoveland, to grandpa ELMER HOLLAND, to grandma Emily Holland, and to Christopher Joseph.

FISCHER QUINTS CELEBRATE THIRD ANNIVERSARY

Mr. REIFEL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from South Dakota?

There was no objection.

Mr. REIFEL. Mr. Speaker, I am sure the Members of this body will want to join Americans all across the land in extending warmest birthday greetings to the famous Fischer quints of Aberdeen, S. Dak.

It is a pleasure to report that the Fischer quints—Cathy, Maggie, Margie, Mary Ann, and Jimmy—are 3 years old today.

On behalf of this great body, I take pride in extending to them and their parents, Andrew and Mary Ann, warmest congratulations on this third birthday of my most famous constituents.

SLEEPER PROVISIONS IN THE DEMONSTRATION CITIES BILL

Mr. GROVER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. GROVER. Mr. Speaker, as a former local school board member, I was shocked with the startling disclosure yesterday by the distinguished gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. BROCK] that the demonstration cities bill contains sleeper provisions which are an open door to federally dominated, super-centralized, megalopolitan schools.

This would seem to bear out the fears of many who have cautioned America to beware of the Johnson administration's program of Federal dominance of our education system.

It has also been brought to my attention that "a new U.S. Office of Education policy supporting family life education and sex education as an integral part of the curriculum from preschool to college and adult levels has been issued by U.S. Commissioner of Education Harold Howe II," and that the U.S. Office of Education "will support training for teachers and health and guidance personnel at all levels of instruction; it will aid programs designed to help parents carry out their roles in family life education and sex education; and it will support research and development in all aspects of family life education and sex education."

Mr. Speaker, this preemption of the determinative powers of our State education departments and the authority of our local school boards by Federal education officials has, with the approbation of the Johnson administration, a peculiar resemblance to the system at work in totalitarian countries.

Certainly, there are many problems, many difficulties, many controversies to be faced in our laudable goal to achieve sound, quality education for every American, but the sovietization of our education systems is not going to be tolerated by the American people as the price of necessary Federal assistance.

CONFEREES APPOINTED

Mr. JONES of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table the bill (S. 1310) re-

lating to the National Museum of the Smithsonian Institution, with the House amendment, insist on the House amendment and agree to the conference requested by the Senate.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Missouri?

The Chair hears none, and appoints the following conferees: Messrs. JONES of Missouri, THOMPSON of New Jersey, and CORBETT.

GRANT OF ADDITIONAL TRAVEL AUTHORITY TO THE COMMITTEE ON PUBLIC WORKS

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, by the direction of the Committee on Rules, I call up House Resolution 968 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

H. Res. 968

Resolved, That, notwithstanding the provisions of H. Res. 141, Eighty-ninth Congress, the Committee on Public Works is hereby authorized to send five of its members and two staff assistants to Rome, Italy, to attend the International Conference of Turnpike, Bridge, and Government Officials from September 23, 1966, to October 1, 1966, inclusive.

Notwithstanding section 1754 of title 22, United States Code, or any other provisions of law, local currencies owned by the United States shall be made available to the Committee on Public Works, House of Representatives, and employees engaged in carrying out their official duties under section 190(d) of title 2, United States Code: *Provided*, (1) That no member or employee of said committee shall receive or expend local currencies or appropriated funds for subsistence in any country at a rate in excess of the maximum per diem rate set forth in section 502(b) of the Mutual Security Act of 1954, as amended by Public Law 88-633, approved October 7, 1964; (2) that no member or employee of said committee shall receive or expend an amount for transportation in excess of actual transportation costs; and (3) no appropriated funds shall be expended for the purpose of defraying expenses of members of said committee or its employees in any country where counterpart funds are available for this purpose.

That each member or employee of said committee shall make to the chairman of said committee an itemized report showing the number of days visited in each country where local currencies were spent, the amount of per diem furnished, and the cost of transportation if furnished by public carrier, or if such transportation is furnished by an agency of the United States Government, the identification of the agency. All such individual reports shall be filed by the chairman with the Committee on House Administration and shall be open to public inspection.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Virginia is recognized.

Mr. HALL. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. I yield to the gentleman from Missouri.

Mr. HALL. Mr. Speaker, I appreciate the gentleman's yielding. As I understand, the members of the Committee on Public Works would go to two different places: One, the International Road Federation meeting in London; the other, a meeting of the Turnpike, Bridge, and Government Officials. I

presume that is an international conference of a construction outfit in Rome.

Are they going to the two meetings on the same trip? One is in September, the other early October. I presume they will go from one to the other, or does the distinguished chairman of the Committee on Rules know about this?

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. I wish to discuss the resolution which is now before the House, which is No. 312. The resolution provides not that the committee as a whole will make the trip, but it provides that a subcommittee of five members and two staff members will be authorized to make this annual trip to Rome, Italy, to attend the International Conference of Turnpike, Bridge, and Government Officials from September 23, 1966, to October 1, 1966. This is an annual international convention with regard to highways and public works.

An identical resolution was passed unanimously at the last session of Congress, and the language of the resolution is simply taken from the other resolution so as to permit our Representatives to attend this international conference on highway construction.

Another resolution which we will reach after discussion of this one will authorize another subcommittee to go to London for a similar type of meeting, the Fifth World Meeting of the International Road Federation, which is to be held in London, England.

Mr. HALL. Mr. Speaker, if the gentleman will yield further, I presume that in this resolution that has just now become available on the floor, there are all the usual reservations and provisos of the Committee on Rules for reporting and using counterpart funds?

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. Yes. It is identical to the one we had last year. Of course, this was reported by the Committee on Rules several days ago.

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

GRANTING ADDITIONAL TRAVEL AUTHORITY TO THE COMMITTEE ON PUBLIC WORKS

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Rules, I call up House Resolution 969 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

H. Res. 969

Resolved, That, notwithstanding the provisions of H. Res. 141, Eighty-ninth Congress, the Committee on Public Works is hereby authorized to send five of its members and two staff assistants to London, England, to attend the Fifth World Meeting of the International Road Federation from September 16, 1966, to September 27, 1966, inclusive.

Notwithstanding section 1754 of title 22, United States Code, or any other provisions of law, local currencies owned by the United States shall be made available to the Committee on Public Works, House of Representatives, and employees engaged in carrying out their official duties under section 190(d) of title 2, United States Code: *Provided*, (1) That no member or employee of said committee shall receive or expend local currencies or appropriated funds for sub-

sistence in any country at a rate in excess of the maximum per diem rate set forth in section 502(b) of the Mutual Security Act of 1954, as amended by Public Law 88-633, approved October 7, 1964; (2) that no member or employee of said committee shall receive or expend an amount for transportation in excess of actual transportation costs; and (3) no appropriated funds shall be expended for the purpose of defraying expenses of members of said committee or its employees in any country where counterpart funds are available for this purpose.

That each member or employee of said committee shall make to the chairman of said committee an itemized report showing the number of days visited in each country where local currencies were spent, the amount of per diem furnished, and the cost of transportation if furnished by public carrier, or if such transportation is furnished by an agency of the United States Government, the identification of the agency. All such individual reports shall be filed by the chairman with the Committee on House Administration and shall be open to public inspection.

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

FOREIGN ASSISTANCE APPROPRIATION BILL FOR FISCAL YEAR 1967

Mr. PASSMAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Appropriations may have until midnight Friday, September 16, 1966, to file a report on the foreign assistance appropriation bill for fiscal year 1967.

Mr. SHRIVER reserved all points of order on the bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Louisiana?

There was no objection.

TAX LEGISLATION NEEDED NOW

Mr. CAMERON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

Mr. CAMERON. Mr. Speaker, President Johnson has prescribed needed tax legislation for the economic health of our Nation. By promptly following his prescription, we will start to alleviate strains on the economy and help assure its continued soundness.

Symptoms of these strains are obvious to everyone: the housewife, the farmer, the businessman. Their causes are no mystery: the needs of a progressive society, heavy business investments, the cost of deterring aggression.

It is clear that the time has come for corrective action. I submit that the proposals of the President constitute a reasonable, prudent, and necessary first step for the Congress and the Nation to take.

Special incentives for plant and equipment investment and commercial construction have accomplished their purpose of stimulating investment, expanding our industrial output and providing more jobs. They will do so again. However, at this time, it is important that we

move quickly to prevent investments from impairing the delicate balance of the economy. Temporary suspension of these incentives will not threaten our welfare, but rather will—I hope not belatedly—help preserve America's unprecedented prosperity. I pledge my support to the President's proposals and urge their immediate enactment in the national interest.

CALL OF THE HOUSE

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, I make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The SPEAKER. Evidently a quorum is not present.

Mr. BOGGS. Mr. Speaker, I move a call of the House.

A call of the House was ordered.

The Clerk called the roll, and the following Members failed to answer to their names:

[Roll No. 281]

Abbitt	Fogarty	Powell
Abernethy	Friedel	Quie
Albert	Gallagher	Rees
Andrews,	Garmatz	Reinecke
Glenn	Hagan, Ga.	Resnick
Ashley	Hansen, Idaho	Rogers, Tex.
Aspinall	Harvey, Ind.	Roncalio
Bandstra	Hawkins	Roybal
Boland	Hébert	St Germain
Boiling	Helstoski	Senner
Celler	Hicks	Sickles
Colmer	Holland	Sisk
Conable	Horton	Stephens
Conyers	Irwin	Stratton
Corman	Jones, N.C.	Teague, Tex.
Curtin	Karth	Todd
Davis, Ga.	Kastenmeier	Toll
Dent	King, N.Y.	Trimble
Devine	Landrum	Tuten
Dickinson	McMillan	Udall
Diggs	Macdonald	Van Deerlin
Dorn	Martin, Ala.	Vigorito
Edmondson	Martin, Mass.	Walker, Miss.
Edwards, La.	Morris	Walker, N. Mex.
Evans, Colo.	Morrison	Weltner
Fallon	Murray	White, Idaho
Farbstein	O'Konski	Willis
Farnsley	O'Neill, Mass.	Wilson
Fisher	Pelly	Charles H.
Flynt	Pool	

The SPEAKER. On this rollcall, 345 Members have answered to their names, a quorum.

By unanimous consent, further proceedings under the call were dispensed with.

COMMITTEE ON APPROPRIATIONS

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Appropriations have until midnight Thursday, September 15, 1966, to file a report on the public works appropriation bill for the fiscal year 1967.

Mr. JONAS reserved all points of order on the bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

MILITARY CONSTRUCTION APPROPRIATION BILL, 1967

Mr. SIKES. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of

the Union for the consideration of the bill (H.R. 17637) making appropriations for military construction for the Department of Defense for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1967, and for other purposes; and pending that motion, Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that general debate on the bill be limited to 3 hours, the time to be equally divided and controlled by the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. CEDERBERG] and myself.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Florida?

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Florida.

The motion was agreed to.

IN THE COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE

Accordingly, the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H.R. 17637), with Mr. ULLMAN in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

By unanimous consent, the first reading of the bill was dispensed with.

The CHAIRMAN. Under the unanimous-consent agreement, the gentleman from Florida [Mr. SIKES] will be recognized for 1½ hours, and the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. CEDERBERG] will be recognized for 1½ hours.

Mr. SIKES. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Chairman, I would hope we could have the attention of the Members. This is a very important matter. We are discussing H.R. 17637, a bill making appropriations for military construction and family housing in the Department of Defense for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1967.

I should like to point out initially that this bill is accompanied by a very complete report. The members of the committee hope that Members will read it in detail. We consider that it gives a good picture of the status of military construction at this time.

This year, Mr. Chairman, in making its recommendations, the committee dealt with the smallest budget program sent to the Congress for military construction in many years. It is just over a billion dollars in scope.

As a matter of fact, and I believe this is somewhat significant, this program for all military housing, for all military facilities—airfields, training facilities, et cetera—for all the military construction that is to be available for America's uniformed personnel throughout the world, is only three times as large as the highway beautification program approved by this House just a few weeks ago. That is a somewhat startling commentary, and possibly not a very creditable situation.

Last year we had a program of nearly \$3 billion for military construction. This year a studied effort was made within OSD to eliminate all projects not directly required for the Vietnamese war. In view of the careful screening already made, the committee realizes there is justification for nearly everything requested, and our cuts have been quite

small. I hope, Mr. Chairman, there will be no further cuts. I just do not believe they would be justifiable. This is a "barebones" program.

The committee has operated under considerable difficulty. Members will recall that it was in 1964, just after the military construction bill had been passed and signed into law, that the first large base closure order was announced.

In 1965, with another year's budget before us, we were assured that the current program was essential to the military program and that all the items listed were required. Scarcely had that program been authorized and funded and the bill signed into law when a deferral order of the construction was announced as an anti-inflation measure. It affected more than \$600 million for projects that were contained in last year's budget program.

That was in November. Then in December there was a second base closure order. It affected some of the projects which the House Armed Services Committee had authorized and which the Appropriations Committee had funded. This closure was made despite the assurances just given us that they were needed projects.

In neither case was there any advance warning that the committee might use as the basis for its own action.

Understandably, the committee now is not certain whom to believe, or when. I do not doubt that those who testified were doing so in good faith. They were stating requirements for military construction based on the guidelines assigned to the program then before the Congress. Subsequently, a new set of orders from the top reflected changed decisions at the OSD and White House levels and both the Congress and the witnesses were left holding the bag.

It would be more realistic to say that the U.S. military personnel and their families are the ones who are left holding the bag. For they are left without housing, which in many instances is very badly needed; they are left without modern training facilities, which the new projects would have provided, and these sacrifices our country does not seem to feel necessary to require of people not wearing the uniform.

This slowdown in construction adds to the obsolescence of the military real property facilities where uniformed personnel live and work. At the \$3 billion level, which was funded last year, the committee felt the Nation was making satisfactory progress in updating and modernizing our military plants. Now we are losing ground again. This means, among other things, higher maintenance costs. Old structures cost more to maintain and it is possible to reach a point at which they are not worth maintaining. Some of them are in that category.

I can tell you that the committee has been assured again and again that the deferred items still are needed, and that they will in nearly all cases, be built. Under the wording of the fiscal year 1967 budget message, they are to be built during this fiscal year. But at this date,

there is no definite word of the date of their construction. I can assure the House that the money appropriated for these projects cannot be diverted to other uses. It can be reclaimed by the Congress, but I hope that will not be necessary.

In this bill there is only \$40 million for the South Vietnamese milcon program. This program was funded in the 1966 regular and supplemental appropriations bills: \$843 million is set aside for the war effort, and there is in addition, an unused \$200 million emergency fund. This will not be enough, but the additional funds which are required will be made a part of the Vietnamese war supplemental which is anticipated will be required late this year or next year.

The committee has not funded, with one exception, the nonbudgeted items added by the Committee on Armed Services, in the amount of \$37½ million. That exception was a sewage disposal plant at Fort Jackson, where a time problem associated with city action on a concurrently built project requires U.S. participation now. This action is requested by letter from OSD and the amount is \$1,441,000.

There is little doubt but that need exists for most or all of the other nonbudgeted items, but where would the committee start if we attempted to choose? There is no assurance the money would be spent by OSD. In fact, the latest message from the President on steps to curb inflation said nonbudgeted appropriations would not be spent. I have his message here, and I will read from it briefly. The President said this in his recent message to the Congress:

I am prepared to defer and reduce Federal expenditures—

By withholding appropriations provided above my budget recommendations whenever possible.

Now, if I may proceed for one moment and then I am going to yield to the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. EVINS], it is said that these nonbudgeted items would have to take their turn behind the deferred items and behind the current budget line items. Very little planning has been done on them, and this would mean a further delay. Consequently, the committee has noted in its report that planning be completed on all of the nonbudgeted items which were authorized so that they can be fed into the program as rapidly as possible.

Mr. Chairman, personally, I hope that this will be done, and that these items will be fed into the program as rapidly as possible. This gives them a head start on other projects which have not been authorized.

Mr. EVINS of Tennessee. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield to me?

Mr. SIKES. Of course, I yield to the distinguished gentleman from Tennessee.

Mr. EVINS of Tennessee. Mr. Chairman, I wish to commend the gentleman from Florida [Mr. SIKES] for his great work on this military construction bill.

Mr. Chairman, this is an important bill. The gentleman from Florida has pointed out the fact that there is contained in the appropriation the sum of \$1 billion; whereas heretofore we have appropriated about \$3 billion. Yet, the Vietnam war is on and there is a need for an accelerated effort.

Mr. Chairman, I want to point out to the Members of the Whole House on the State of the Union that the gentleman has cut down on the budget and that approval has not been given to appropriations requested for new money that is not essential in meeting the urgencies of the war in Vietnam.

Mr. Chairman, the Secretary of Defense has announced the closing of certain bases. In light of this, I want to ask the gentleman from Florida [Mr. SIKES] one or two questions, the first one of which is:

What is the situation with respect to the closing of certain bases? I know that the Committee on Armed Services has held hearings with reference to the matter.

Mr. Chairman, information has been furnished to the effect that these bases are vital, necessary, and are operational. Unfortunately, some of them should be closed.

However, Mr. Chairman, I shall ask the gentleman from Florida [Mr. SIKES] if the gentleman will address his remarks, briefly, to this situation and secondly, I want to commend the gentleman for assuring the Members of the House that planning money is provided in those cases where it is felt necessary.

Mr. Chairman, I believe that these construction items should move forward.

Mr. SIKES. Mr. Chairman, I appreciate the comments from my distinguished friend, the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. EVINS], as to the approval which is given to our approach by responsible Members of the House.

Mr. Chairman, as one who has been disturbed about many aspects of the closure orders—I would say that when all the facts are known and all the additional circumstances have been tallied and all of the factors have been considered for the closures which have been announced, one will find that the Nation might have lost rather than saved money as a result of the base-closure orders.

The gentleman from Tennessee has asked, What is the situation on the base closings?

Mr. Chairman, I want to state to the gentleman that there have been no changes whatsoever. There has not been one appreciable change in the base closings that have been announced. I do not think it is going to be possible to conform to these closings announcement, but as of this date there has been little change.

Mr. EVINS of Tennessee. I wonder if the gentleman from Florida [Mr. SIKES] could explain why it is necessary to close bases when it is uneconomical and wasteful to do so, especially to close those bases that are operational and vital and which

are being used today. I wonder why it is prudent to close those bases which have permanent housing located thereon.

Mr. Chairman, it would certainly seem to me unreasonable, uneconomical, and unwise to do so.

Mr. SIKES. In many respects I agree fully with what the gentleman has said. I have so stated on many occasions. I do not think that it is sound economy to build up huge bases which are very vulnerable, with 25,000 or 30,000 personnel and with all the attendant additional costs that are associated with those bases, plus the losses we are going to take on the bases that are closed.

Mr. KUNKEL. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SIKES. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. KUNKEL. Mr. Chairman, I would like to call attention to another cost factor in the closing of bases, and that is the training of personnel.

As you know, they closed the Olmsted Air Force Base up at Middletown, Pa. At that time Secretary McNamara said that 65 percent of the men would take functional transfers.

I have worked with the men down at the base, and with some of the employees, and we figured that only 35 percent would take a functional transfer. Recently I checked with Middletown and I found that only about 22 percent have taken a functional transfer.

Some of these men went to Oklahoma City. Out at Oklahoma City they cannot get trained personnel. The estimated cost of training a man up to the standards that they had at Middletown was about \$25,000 per man. I am absolutely convinced that if you dig into the so-called savings that Mr. McNamara says he is making on base closings, such as in the attendant difficulties at Middletown, you will find he has created a great deal additional debt for the Government because it just is not paying out, and it cannot pay out.

Mr. SIKES. I am afraid that situation is going to be repeated in many communities. This accentuates the statement previously made by the distinguished gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. EVINS] and by myself.

I appreciate the gentleman's observations.

Now, Mr. Chairman, I would like to talk about the construction program in South Vietnam, and I hope that I may have your attention on this subject, particularly since there has been considerable discussion in the news media about it. One commentator recently called it a major scandal. I consider this a very unfortunate choice of words.

I do know that the program has been costly, very costly. The urgency for early completion of badly needed facilities has been the keynote.

Urgency of construction invites trouble, even when you build a house right here in the United States.

I do not doubt for a moment, Mr. Chairman, that there has been waste, nor that pilferage has taken place in the

construction program in Vietnam—pilferage is away of life in some parts of the world—or that some supervisory personnel may have taken advantage of an opportunity to make a fast dollar on the side. These things can happen on all big projects—regrettably—but they happen in this country and abroad.

Your subcommittee has held hearings on the program. Those hearings are available in printed form, as part 3 of Military Construction Appropriations for 1967. If you will read the printed record I believe it will answer most of the questions that may come to your mind. I hope you will ask for and keep before you a copy of these hearings on the construction in South Vietnam.

As a matter of fact, that constitutes the only printed record of any inquiry into that program available at this time. There will be others later, of course.

These hearings show that the program has been costly. We did not know what it was going to cost when we went out there. We had no plans or specifications to begin with in an area halfway around the world.

The contractors, selected because a part of the combine already was operating in South Vietnam, had to accumulate and ship materials and equipment and to recruit personnel to do one of the biggest construction jobs in history. They were told to build 10 ports, 24 logistics or tactical air bases, 4 logistics depots, and 40 brigade cantonments, plus communications facilities, plus roads, plus bridges, plus contractors cantonments, in an area where almost nothing existed before. They are at the end of a 10,000-mile supply line—halfway around the world. They must be supplied largely by air and water transportation. The Vietcong control the roads or cut them almost at will, and their use has been denied to our forces. In June of 1965 we had in Vietnam 25,000 U.S. forces. Now there are 300,000 of them, plus a 50,000-man contractor force for whom to build. This construction program, which is in high gear despite the mistakes and which is registering steady progress every day, is one of the most amazing in history. A great deal of credit is due to the personnel, military and civilian, who accomplished it. No other country could have done it or would have attempted it. But had we not done so our forces would have to continue to live in tents. We would operate haphazardly through one congested port or over the beaches and our supply operations would be conducted on a hit or miss basis, which might or might not get needed equipment to the troops in the field.

None of that situation is true today. It is an amazing story, despite the mistakes.

There are Monday morning quarterbacks who now tell us what is wrong with the program and how it could have been done better and for less money. It is easy enough to do those things now. It takes no particular skill to use hindsight. Some significant changes are being made

in the program and it is well that we understand what has happened. First, there has been a scaling down of the program assigned to the contractor combine. Originally, nearly all the work in Vietnam was assigned to the contractor combine. Subsequently, there has been a substantial buildup in the number of Navy Seabee and Army engineer construction battalions. Their number has been increased from 3 to 24. This makes a significant difference in the ability to get work done with troop labor. These units perform prodigiously. Their work everywhere is outstanding. Every available unit of this nature should have been in Vietnam from the time we launched the construction program, but they were not. Now, however, they are doing many of the jobs which it was originally planned that the contractor group would do. In addition, the Air Force, under pressure to secure an airbase where one is vitally needed, obtained permission from OSD to set up Operation Turnkey, a \$52 million complete airbase for which the contractor will supply all of his own material, equipment, and labor. They began operation full scale on September 1 and expect to complete the airport by May. This further reduces the scope of work assigned to the contractor group. Originally, theirs was a \$960 million program. Now it is estimated at \$780 million.

Department officials testified to our committee that the charges which I have discussed will have no major effect on the overall cost of the program, but that they will speed it up. They state that the contractor combine would have undergone a normal tuneup following the very rapid expansion of operating capacity, even if they were still charged with the entire program. However, there is some surplus of labor and of material and of equipment.

In labor the contractor combine built up to a level of 53,700. They are to be reduced to 47,000. The very great majority of this labor is native personnel. There is an extremely rapid turnover, even of U.S. personnel employed by the contractor. The contractor states that normal attrition and elimination of unsatisfactory personnel will easily bring about the presently desired level of employment.

Witnesses testified that the change in the program—which is not a cutback but is a readjustment—has resulted in \$12 million worth of excess equipment. Half of this is still on the U.S. west coast. It will not be shipped unless needed. The remainder will be available for use by troop labor if desired. It is well to bear in mind though that wear out of equipment is extremely fast under Vietnamese conditions and most of the equipment very probably will be needed before the completion of the jobs. It is also estimated that \$15 to \$20 million worth of material excess to the contractor combine exists. Presumably, most of this will be needed by troop labor. Otherwise it will represent a loss. It is well to keep in mind the fact that the program

is still far from complete but that it is moving forward with extreme rapidity. An enormous program is in operation and within a year it should be complete.

I have some other thoughts on this matter. It appears to me that the principal problems have resulted from a lack of plans and specifications on which greater emphasis should be placed even now, that audits should be further tightened—the auditing program was applied late and still is not fully operational—that more troop construction units should have been used from the beginning and more should be used now.

It further appears to me that the confusion which has existed and the changes made at a late date in the program simply indicates that the left hand in the Pentagon sometimes does not know what the right is doing. There is a great need for planning in depth to meet future construction problems as they arise and this committee so urges in our report. Amazingly little advance planning has been done in order to be ready for construction emergencies. We have to keep this program going because until we get bases and supply depots and ports we cannot have in Vietnam enough troops to hold and police and make secure the countryside. The war will not be won until we can deny the enemy the broad base of operations he now enjoys.

I am very pleased that General Westmoreland stated a day or two ago that we do plan as of now to start holding territory when we take it and securing it rather than retiring to secure areas and having the Vietcong follow us right back to the walls behind which we find ourselves.

Now returning to the bill itself, as I said, the cuts were small. I think they should have been. Many of the items which the committee eliminated are those which normally are associated with administrative type activities—these in most instance we believe in wartime can wait. The reduction includes facilities where no real effort has been made to utilize existing facilities. Despite the fact that year after year we have insisted in the committee and the Congress, the Pentagon seems reluctant to make do with good facilities if this means a shift in program or place. We are eliminating items where there was insufficient evidence of long-range planning or of continued need.

Total cuts were \$95,607,000, which includes authorization cuts of \$76,136,000.

Let me mention one final item. Efforts are in progress to develop a workable program for disposal of housing owned by military or civilian personnel at closed bases. There are funds in this bill for that purpose, but the committee is working with the House Committee on Banking and Currency, and it is hopeful that a sound program can be developed in that bill along the lines of the administration's request. This will provide some controls on that program. It will keep expenditures within reasonable bounds. At the same time, it will help to relieve the problem of those who are

left with unsalable housing or housing which can only be disposed of at a loss.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SIKES. I am happy to yield to my distinguished friend from Iowa.

Mr. GROSS. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Are there any funds that have been deferred with respect to this bill, of which the gentleman is aware, which will come in later on in a supplemental appropriation bill, which the gentleman from Texas [Mr. MAHON] tells us will be in the nature of \$5 billion to \$15 billion?

Mr. SIKES. We have not been apprised of the type of items which will be carried for construction in the supplemental bill. We do anticipate there will be a supplemental bill later this year or early next year. That supplemental bill almost inevitably will include some facilities which OSD considers essential to the Vietnamese war effort, but we have no guidelines on which I could base an answer to the gentleman as to what specific projects would be included.

Mr. GROSS. But there are no funds deliberately delayed, insofar as consideration of the bill before us is concerned?

Mr. SIKES. That is definitely true. I can give the gentleman full assurance that is definitely true.

Mr. GROSS. If I might, I should like to ask one or two additional questions.

Is there any money in this bill with respect to military construction in Europe because of the withdrawal of France from NATO?

Mr. SIKES. No.

Mr. GROSS. And the closing of bases?

Mr. SIKES. No. That is going to cause some problems, but it has not been reflected in requests to the Congress for appropriation for military construction. There is nothing in this bill that would have to do with changes in locations or basing of forces due to changes in the NATO structure. That is a disturbing situation, but there is nothing in this bill that has to do with it.

Mr. GROSS. I have one final question, if the gentleman will bear with me.

The Senate majority leader and other Members of the Senate are asking that some of our troops in Europe be withdrawn and brought back to this country. In the event that there should be a substantial withdrawal of troops from Europe to this country, are bases available and are facilities available to house, let us say, two or three or four divisions?

Mr. SIKES. In my opinion there is no doubt, if it is necessary to bring troops back to this country from Europe—and I believe a readjustment is due—that we can find facilities for them in the closed base areas or in areas which are not being fully utilized. In the main, facilities at least temporarily can be found for them without additional construction.

Mr. GROSS. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. WAGGONER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SIKES. I am happy to yield to the distinguished gentleman from Louisiana.

Mr. WAGGONER. Mr. Chairman, I simply wish to thank the gentleman from Florida [Mr. SIKES] and indeed the whole Committee on Appropriations, for having brought us a bill which is in every way in keeping with the needs of our military.

The gentleman from Florida [Mr. SIKES] has made a statement to this House today which, in my opinion, is as well reasoned as any thinking American could ever expect. I am appreciative of the fact that we have a Committee on Appropriations as well as an authorization committee here in the House of Representatives whose desires are attuned to the needs of this country in these times of emergency.

Mr. SIKES. The gentleman has been most kind in his comments.

Mr. Chairman, I now yield to the distinguished gentleman from North Carolina, a member of the subcommittee [Mr. JONAS].

Mr. JONAS. I think it would be well, in view of the first question that was asked the chairman by the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. GROSS] to elaborate for just a minute on the answer. Will the chairman correct me or will he refresh my memory if I am not correct on this point? My recollection is that the witnesses stated that according to the best estimates right now the contractor construction program in Vietnam would probably be completed toward the end of 1967.

Mr. SIKES. October 1967 is the date when the present work of the construction contractors is scheduled to be complete.

Mr. JONAS. We were assured that funds are available to run the program according to plan through about the spring of next year. Is that correct?

Mr. SIKES. That is correct.

Mr. JONAS. But thereafter additional funds would be required?

Mr. SIKES. That is very true. I think the House would be interested in a little clarification on the actual cost of the program in Vietnam. We have built up the construction in Vietnam to a level of \$40 million a month of work in place. It has gone over that to some extent, but it will be scaled down to that level. Now, that does not mean \$40 million a month will be required each month from nonexpended funds. The material and equipment have been purchased. It is anticipated there is enough money to run the RMK-BRJ contract until next spring, as the gentleman indicated.

Mr. JONAS. Will the gentleman yield further?

Mr. SIKES. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. JONAS. The \$40 million figure means that \$40 million worth of construction is put in place each month.

Mr. SIKES. That is right.

Mr. BURLESON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SIKES. I yield to my colleague from Texas.

Mr. BURLESON. First, I wish to compliment the distinguished gentleman and his committee for performing a very difficult task. I know the decisions connected with our military installations are not easy to make and that the pressures are many.

Mr. Chairman, I wish to ask the distinguished gentleman from Florida to clarify his previous statement regarding projects listed on pages 16 and 17 under the heading "Authorized projects not included in the budget programs."

The gentleman has referred to the committee's plans and intent to consider these projects for planning, but I wish to be certain that I thoroughly understand exactly what this means.

I am especially interested in the development at Fort Wolters, located in my congressional district. This installation is the largest helicopter training base in the world. It has the finest equipment and, without a doubt, is contributing to a high degree to our efforts in South Vietnam by graduating 375 pilots per month in primary helicopter training.

The installation is highly efficient in all respects except in its academic training. At the present time academic instructions are held in numerous World War II temporary buildings located over the far-flung base, resulting in a waste of time, energy and efficiency in every regard. A central academic building is greatly needed and, as a matter of fact, I think it would be justified in describing it as critical. There is little doubt but this installation would have had an academic building included if conditions had been recognized when the budget was made up as it is today.

Be this as it may, Mr. Chairman, I hope the distinguished chairman of the subcommittee will give a further explanation on this point. If my understanding is correct, the committee provides for the planning of this particular project and others in the same category and that funds will be provided in the fiscal 1967-68 budget. This being the case, I trust I am correct that this development will move ahead a year, which would not be the case unless this authority for planning is clearly provided.

As a matter of fact, Mr. Chairman, I hope that this particular installation at Fort Wolters may be viewed with an eye on bringing about a greater efficiency because of its tremendous importance to our southeast Asian effort and that it may yet be decided that it be included in a supplemental appropriation which is likely to come along in the early part of next session of the Congress.

If the gentleman will comment further on this particular project and others in the same status which he may see proper, I shall greatly appreciate it.

Mr. SIKES. The gentleman is eminently correct. May I state that the distinguished gentleman not only represents an area in which is located a very important base, but he is an outspoken, able, and strong supporter for that base and I commend him for his interest in it.

Mr. Chairman, permit me to repeat what I pointed out just a very few moments ago.

The committee has placed in the bill planning money for all nonbudgeted items. Planning has proceeded only to a limited extent at best upon most of these items. The committee has put them all on an equal footing by directing that planning be completed so that projects and budgets will be ready to be sent forward in a budget message when the Department sees fit to do so.

Personally, Mr. Chairman, I am sympathetic with the problem. I recognize the need for training facilities and I would hope that this one would be budgeted shortly.

Mr. BURLISON. Mr. Chairman, I thank the distinguished gentleman from Florida very kindly for yielding to me.

Mr. FARNUM. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SIKES. I yield to my distinguished friend, the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. FARNUM].

Mr. FARNUM. Mr. Chairman, I wish to rise at this point to commend the distinguished gentleman from Florida and the Committee on Appropriations for the fine report that they have brought out on military construction.

But, however, Mr. Chairman, I wish to draw attention to a very important portion of this report which appears on page 12 thereof. It draws attention to the need for increased audit programs.

Further, Mr. Chairman, I would also commend to every Member of the House the reading of the hearings which were held on this subject in August of 1966. I wholeheartedly agree with the recommendations contained therein, having been a former auditor, and I feel that we should have more emphasis on this type of approach.

Again, Mr. Chairman, I commend the gentleman from Florida [Mr. SIKES] for insisting upon this approach.

Mr. SIKES. Mr. Chairman, I am very happy that my distinguished friend, the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. FARNUM], has made this observation.

Mr. Chairman, I believe the fact that the auditing processes were delayed in getting started on an effective basis represents one of the real weaknesses of this program. The audit program should be made completely effective just as rapidly as possible.

Mr. Chairman, as a part of my statement I will place in the Record at this point the first 13 pages of the committee report, which I do hope all Members of Congress will read.

SUMMARY OF THE BILL AND COMMITTEE ACTION

Budget estimates considered by the Committee are contained in the President's Budget as set forth beginning on pages 337 and 380. These estimates total \$1,114,947,000. The Committee recommends the appropriation of \$1,019,340,000, a reduction of \$95,607,000 below the estimates and \$1,975,695,000 below the funds appropriated for military construction and family housing in fiscal year 1966. The following tabulation lists, in summary form, appropriations for fiscal year 1966, estimates for fiscal year 1967, and the Committee action on the fiscal year 1967 request.

Summary of the bill and committee action

Agency	Appropriations, 1966	Budget estimates, 1967	Recommended in bill, 1967	Bill compared with—	
				Appropriations, 1966	Budget estimates, 1967
Defense agencies.....	\$269,268,000	\$7,547,000	\$7,547,000	—\$261,721,000	—
Department of the Army.....	843,143,000	190,600,000	146,406,000	—696,737,000	—\$44,194,000
Department of the Navy.....	580,405,000	139,000,000	131,627,000	—448,778,000	—7,373,000
Department of the Air Force.....	636,373,000	255,900,000	222,564,000	—413,809,000	—33,336,000
Family housing.....	665,846,000	521,900,000	511,196,000	—154,650,000	—10,704,000
Total.....	2,995,035,000	1,114,947,000	1,019,340,000	—1,975,695,000	—95,607,000

The reductions recommended by the Committee include \$76,136,000 as a result of the action of the Congress in the Military Construction Authorization Bill for fiscal year 1967 as shown in the following tabulation:

	Military construction	Family housing
Army.....	\$39,130,000	—
Navy.....	5,169,000	—
Air Force.....	21,133,000	—
Defense agencies.....	—	—
Total.....	65,432,000	\$10,704,000

¹ Reduction relates to total leasing program.

All projects recommended by the Committee for funding approval are either authorized by prior law or included in the above mentioned bill.

FUNDS AVAILABLE FOR OBLIGATION AND EXPENDITURE IN FISCAL YEAR 1967

The funds approved by the Committee for military construction, exclusive of family housing, when added to funds remaining unobligated from prior appropriations, will make \$2,215,341,419 available for obligation in fiscal year 1967 for the regular forces, and \$81,104,011 available for the reserve forces, as shown in the following tabulations:

Funds available for obligation in fiscal year 1967

REGULAR FORCES

	Estimated unobligated balance carried forward	Recommended in bill, 1967	Estimated total available for obligation
Department of the Army.....	\$748,374,544	\$146,406,000	\$894,780,544
Department of the Navy.....	391,716,549	126,227,000	517,943,549
Department of the Air Force.....	378,309,363	209,564,000	587,873,363
Defense agencies.....	207,196,963	7,547,000	214,743,963
Total.....	1,725,597,419	489,744,000	2,215,341,419

RESERVE COMPONENTS

Department of the Army.....	\$32,053,669		\$32,053,669
Department of the Navy.....	10,481,280	\$5,400,000	15,881,280
Department of the Air Force.....	20,169,032	13,000,000	33,169,032
Total.....	62,704,011	18,400,000	81,104,011

NOTE.—Excludes family housing.

The appropriations made available in the accompanying bill for military construction, exclusive of family housing, when added to unexpended balances remaining from prior

appropriations, will make \$3,076,271,331 available for expenditure for the regular forces, and \$95,917,754 for the reserve forces, as shown in the following tabulations:

Funds available for expenditure in fiscal year 1967

REGULAR FORCES

	Estimated unexpended balance carried forward	Recommended in bill, 1967	Estimated total available for expenditure
Department of the Army.....	\$1,047,595,034	\$146,406,000	\$1,194,001,034
Department of the Navy.....	507,511,050	126,227,000	633,738,050
Department of the Air Force.....	800,072,167	209,564,000	1,009,636,167
Defense agencies.....	231,349,080	7,547,000	238,896,080
Total.....	2,586,527,331	489,744,000	3,076,271,331

RESERVE COMPONENTS

Department of the Army.....	\$32,487,378		\$32,487,378
Department of the Navy.....	14,320,874	\$5,400,000	19,720,874
Department of the Air Force.....	30,709,502	13,000,000	43,709,502
Total.....	77,517,754	18,400,000	95,917,754

NOTE.—Excludes family housing.

GENERAL STATEMENT

The military construction program is a dynamic part of the total defense program geared to provide the proper military posture of this nation. It is in direct support of the missions, objectives and operating requirements of the military services and the various defense agencies. The projects contained therein are in consonance with the overall Department of Defense programs for fiscal year 1967 and the overall objectives of the Department for the fiscal years 1967-1971 time period.

The increasing obsolescence of military real property facilities, especially in the non-operational categories, is a matter of concern. There are limits to what even sound maintenance programs can achieve in extending the useful life of buildings constructed to temporary standards, during World War II and the Korean conflict, many of which are still in hard use on far too many military installations. In many instances we are past the point of diminishing returns in the continued use of these structures. For example, over one-fourth of the total physical plant at the permanent installations of the Army is composed of World War II temporary structures that are becoming seriously deteriorated. In addition, few, if any, of the personnel facilities constructed in these time periods can be held to be even remotely adequate by the standards which are necessary today.

The fiscal year 1966 military construction program placed major emphasis on the modernization of the basic capital plant, particularly troop housing and other support facilities for military personnel. It is regrettable that the Secretary of Defense felt that the exigencies in Southeast Asia demanded the deferral of a substantial portion of this phase of the fiscal year 1966 program. The priority demand of this situation for the military construction portion of the Defense budget also led to the use of austere criteria in the formulation of the fiscal year 1967 program. Under these criteria, only those projects required to meet operational schedules, to support new missions, or which are required for other urgent and compelling reasons, such as the health and safety of personnel, were included in the program. Basically, non-operational projects were approved only to meet deficiencies in requirements and not for replacement of existing facilities, inadequate as these existing buildings might be. Projects which did not meet these tests, although fully justified in other respects, were not approved.

The active, long-range programs of the several services for the modernization of real property facilities, implemented in the past several years, has been halted or vastly curtailed. For example, prior to the previously mentioned deferral of projects, the Army had succeeded in reaching an annual level of effort for the replacement of troop housing which was adequate to reach their long-range objective in a reasonable period of time. A similar level was being sought for facilities in other categories, which would have allowed the replacement and modernization of the Army's physical plant over a period of approximately twelve years. Such a program would have required appropriation of approximately \$300,000,000 each year for replacement and modernization alone. The deferral of the fiscal year 1966 program and the austere criteria used in the formulation of the fiscal year 1967 program have resulted in grinding this program to a halt. As a result, when the replacement and modernization program is resumed, an annual level of funding in excess of \$300,000,000 will undoubtedly be necessary if the Army is to reach this desirable objective in this same period of time.

In addition, no funds were requested by the Department in the fiscal year 1967 pro-

gram for the construction of badly needed military family housing. Construction of the 8,500 units approved by the Congress in the fiscal year 1966 program has also been deferred.

Although it can be interpreted by some that these actions are necessary or desirable at this time, they must not lead to the abandonment of the overall objective of the services to achieve modern, efficient, and economical physical plants. Rather, planning and project development must continue. The deferred portion of the fiscal year 1966 program that still represents valid military requirements should be released as promptly as possible. Resumption of the modernization program, including meeting the family housing deficiency, should be resumed unless there is major escalation of the conflict in Southeast Asia. At least a modest increment of these total objectives should be included in the fiscal year 1968 military construction program.

A prime consideration in any real property management program is that maximum and economical use be made of each facility. New construction should not be requested until the capability of existing facilities in the several services have been examined and found to be deficient. The tendency of the past several years to place more emphasis upon the multi-service utilization of major weapons systems, including aircraft, serves to emphasize this requirement. Unfortunately, the commendable multi-service use of weapons systems has not been satisfactorily reflected in the facilities program. Rather, there is apparently a tendency within the services and the Office of the Secretary of Defense to take a parochial view of these programs. There is still a tendency to see that all of the services involved have their slices of the facilities pie that generally accompanies each new weapons system. Far too little effort is being placed on exploring potential joint use of training, maintenance, and overhaul and repair facilities which are available to support weapons systems in use on a multi-service basis. The advent of additional aircraft such as the A-7, F-111 and OV-10A as component parts of the operating inventories of more than one service dictates that this situation cannot be allowed to continue. Major emphasis must be placed on maximum economical utilization of facilities to support multi-service programs and weapons systems. To do otherwise is to fall short of the economies which these programs are designed to achieve.

Testimony before the Committee has repeatedly shown that there is far too little study made of possible use of facilities in other services to meet single service requirements. Instances have been noted where checks were not even made of facilities existing outside of an individual command within a single service to meet facility requirements for a service-wide function. Such situations are, of course, untenable. If realistic construction programs are to be formulated and an efficient and economical physical plant developed for the military services, more realistic efforts must be made to ensure the best use of facilities including inter-service as well as intra-service utilization.

BASE CLOSURES AND DEFERRED PROJECTS

In connection with the fiscal year 1965 military construction program, Congress was requested to authorize and fund construction of various line items at a number of installations. The appropriation bill to implement these programs was enacted into law on September 2, 1964. Shortly thereafter, on November 19, 1964, a base closure announcement was made by the Secretary of Defense that a number of the items were no longer required and that several of the bases at which construction was contemplated were to be closed. Officials of the Department did not advise the Committee during the hearings or thereafter

that some of the specific items might not be required as a result of base closure plans. On September 25, 1965, the Military Construction Appropriation Act for fiscal year 1966 was enacted into law. The Congress approved this program relying specifically on a letter from the Secretary of Defense to the Committee on Appropriations of the House of Representatives dated July 31, 1965 which stated:

"In the case of the current program, you may be assured that each item has been stringently reviewed and there is no request for construction funds at any base likely to be declared excess within the foreseeable future with one exception. At the Naval Shipyard, Portsmouth, New Hampshire, we have approximately \$1.0 million in the current program for construction of a radiological control facility essential to the ship overhaul scheduled there during the ten-year phase-out period. Please be assured that our objective is to insure that line items now being requested are limited to those bases with an assured hard core mission for the five-year program, fiscal year 1966 to fiscal year 1970."

In addition to this assurance, the Committee received assurances from the Assistant Secretary of Defense (Installations and Logistics), the Deputy Assistant Secretary of Defense (Budget), and the budget officers of the military services that the list of line items in the fiscal year 1966 military construction program constituted a "firm list" of items. Bearing in mind the questionable validity of the line items submitted by the Department of Defense in connection with the military construction program for fiscal year 1965, the Committee referred to these assurances in its report on the Military Construction Appropriation Bill, 1966 and quoted specifically from the letter of the Secretary of Defense. In addition, it stated:

"The Committee has therefore acted on the budget request in reliance upon these statements. National defense is a dynamic business and it is possible there will be changes in base requirements which are presently unforeseen. Therefore, the Committee places the Office of the Secretary of Defense and the military services on notice that it will expect to be advised promptly of any projects requested for the fiscal year 1966 program for any installation, the tenure of which is in doubt if the missions assigned are reduced."

Despite these statements, on December 8, 1965 an additional list of base closures and activities changes was announced by the Secretary of the Defense which directed the closure of four bases which were a part of the fiscal year 1966 military construction program. This program included eighteen line items totaling \$12,877,000 for these bases. The Committee was not advised of these changes until the time period of the above mentioned announcement.

In addition, on October 22, 1965 the Secretary of Defense deferred the construction of 8,500 units of family housing authorized and funded as part of the military construction program for fiscal year 1966. This was followed by an announcement on December 20, 1965 that additional projects in the amount of \$459,815,000 had been temporarily deferred. This brought the total amount deferred from the approved fiscal year 1966 program to \$620,000,000.

Actions such as these can only serve to cast a doubt in the minds of members of Congress as to the validity of the budget estimates which are submitted, and the validity of assurances given, by officials of the Department of Defense as to the firmness of their military construction programs. Such actions cast grave doubt on the present methods used by the Department of Defense for the formulation of the annual military construction programs. Apparently, there is too little real coordination between the formulation of these programs and the logistical and operational requirements of the military

services. This Committee realizes that national defense is a dynamic business but changes of this magnitude, made with increasing rapidity, indicate improper programming and management, not dynamic programs.

Once more a military construction program is before the Committee. Once more assurances have been received from Defense officials and the military services on the validity of this program. In this connection, the following colloquy between the Chairman of the Committee and the Assistant Secretary of Defense (Installations and Logistics) is typical:

"Mr. SIKES. Do you know of any new deferral policy that might influence any of the items contained in the present listing?"

"Mr. IGNATIUS. I know of no such deferral policy, and I checked this with my superiors prior to appearing before you. I am able to state it is our intention to proceed with the construction requested in this bill in the event the Congress authorizes and funds it."

"Mr. SIKES. We are going to be called upon, beyond any shadow of a doubt, to give specific answers on this entire question, and I ask you if the Department of Defense, to the best of your knowledge, is considering in any way, shape, or form, programs or base utilization changes or anything else which would cast any doubt or question as to the validity of any items, or need for any items, in this program?"

"Mr. IGNATIUS. To the best of my knowledge, Mr. Chairman, there are no current programs or base utilization studies underway, or contemplated, which would reduce the validity of any of the construction in the 1967 program. As I indicated earlier, we intend to go forward with the projects in the event they are authorized and funded by the Congress, subject only to those changes in missions or operational requirements that are inevitable in a military organization and which may require, at a later date, reassessment of some of the projects now requested."

Yet the rationale of the fiscal year 1967 program is difficult to determine. The Committee finds troop housing being requested at installations where similar troop housing, funded by the Congress in the past, has been deferred. We find additional training facilities programmed at locales where other training facilities have been deferred.

This places the Congress in the strange and untenable position of being asked to pass upon some projects that seem, on the face of them, to be of secondary importance when compared to many of those that have been deferred. As a result, in the Military Construction Authorization Bill, 1967, both the House of Representatives and the Senate took the proper, but unusual, step of requiring certifications by the Secretary of Defense concerning the validity of the construction program presented to the Congress. In effect, this language would preclude the execution of any construction contracts authorized in the fiscal year 1967 bill until those deferred projects previously authorized and funded by the Congress for which there continues to exist valid military requirements have been placed under contract. Projects, authorized in the fiscal year 1967 program, that the Secretary of Defense certifies to be urgently required in the interest of national defense and more essential to the interest of national defense than those military public works which he deferred, are excepted from this requirement.

The President's Budget contemplates the obligation of the deferred funds in fiscal year 1967. Yet the Assistant Secretary of Defense (Installations and Logistics), could give no dates as to when the deferred projects would be allowed to go forward. As a matter of fact, the Department of Defense informed the Committee that four of the projects in the fiscal year 1967 budget, for which \$23,097,000 was requested, would not

go forward ahead of similar items deferred in the fiscal year 1966 program.

The continued deferral of projects presented to the Congress as valid military requirements in the fiscal year 1966 program, and which still meet this test, is resulting in denying to our military forces the facilities which they need.

In addition, the deferral is proving to be a costly action. Reliable construction cost indices show that in the first six months subsequent to the deferral action costs have increased approximately five percent. Additional increases are projected for the future.

Nevertheless, recognizing the obvious need for the construction of additional facilities in fiscal year 1967, the Committee has, once more, acted on the budget request, in reliance upon the assurances from the Department of Defense witnesses that they intend to proceed with the implementation of the projects contained in this program when they have been authorized and funded by the Congress. It has acted in reliance upon the budget obligational schedules which programmed the obligation of funds for the deferral projects in fiscal year 1967. It trusts that the obligation of these latter funds will be forthcoming in a prompt manner and that there will be no bars to the full implementation of the fiscal year 1967 program if the projects contained therein remain as valid military requirements.

HOUSING FOR MILITARY PERSONNEL

In the report accompanying the Military Construction Appropriation Bill, 1966, the Committee laid great stress on the need for increased emphasis on additional troop housing and bachelor officer quarters. It was joined by the officials of the Department of Defense in pointing up the need for strong programs in these vital areas. Unfortunately, in the past several years, the provision of adequate living facilities for military personnel and their dependents has been sadly neglected. This is due to a variety of reasons but primarily because of the necessity to use available military construction funds to provide operational support of new weapons systems and forces necessary to establish and maintain the military posture of this country.

It is an accepted and simple fact that if highly skilled and motivated military personnel, so sorely needed by our military forces, are to remain as career personnel, they and their families must be provided with a more adequate and proper standard of living. The Department of Defense and the Congress must place more emphasis in this important area and provide our military personnel with proper standards of barracks, bachelor officer quarters and family housing.

The Committee deeply regrets the fact that the Secretary of Defense felt it necessary to defer certain essential troop housing facilities and the entire family housing military construction program authorized by the Congress for fiscal year 1966. This has delayed the proper and necessary continued implementation of these essential programs. No funds are requested in the fiscal year 1967 budget for new family housing construction. The budget schedules, however, contemplate proceeding with construction of the deferred units in fiscal year 1967.

The fiscal year 1967 program submitted to the Congress requested funds for additional troop housing and officers quarters. Unfortunately, the amount requested was not as much as it might have otherwise been except for the operations in Southeast Asia. No additional funds were requested for the construction of family housing. The fiscal year 1967 budget includes \$65,912,000 in support of the construction of 23,238 barracks spaces and \$26,281,000 in support of 3,036 bachelor officer quarters.

With few minor exceptions, and for valid reasons, Congress has authorized and the Committee has approved the funding of this program. The Committee can only rely on the assurances of the Department of Defense officials that this program will be promptly implemented and trusts that the deferred projects, including family housing, which remain valid military requirements, will be promptly released for construction.

There is another aspect to the program for the construction of troop housing which must be considered. This phase of the military construction program is controlled to a large extent by unit cost and space limitations. The present allocation of living space for the individual member of the military service resulting from these limitations are basically not conducive to proper and adequate living facilities. The present limitations are also resulting in reduced construction standards and specifications which will probably call for increased maintenance expenditures in the future. All of the military services have made recommendations to the Office of the Secretary of Defense seeking increases in the present limitations. The recent study of the troop housing situation by the Department of Defense has disclosed that current Department of Defense housing standards, i.e., space criteria, for enlisted troops are barely above the level established by the Government for convicts in present Federal prisons, and lower than those for prisoners at the Youth Correction Center at Lorton, Virginia. Unfortunately, many of the troop housing facilities now in use were constructed prior to the implementation of the existing space criteria and provide even less adequate facilities than those called for under present guidelines. Although the Department has been studying this problem, no formal recommendations have been made.

The House of Representatives in the consideration of the military construction authorization legislation increased the present cost limitation for barracks from \$1,850 per man to \$3,450 per man. Likewise, the limitation for permanent bachelor officers quarters was increased from \$8,500 per man to \$10,500 per man. The debate in the House disclosed that the Department of Defense has further limited the cost of bachelor officers facilities to \$7,000, or \$1,500 below the limitation approved by the Congress. This debate also pointed out that not a single troop housing project in the fiscal year 1967 military construction program of the Navy could be designed under these cost limitations even to the present inadequate Department of Defense criteria. Unfortunately, the final version of the authorization bill was in only partial agreement with the House action. The limitation on permanent barracks has been increased to \$2,300 per man; however, the limitation on bachelor officers quarters is continued at \$8,500. In approving funds for troop housing in the accompanying bill, the Committee does so with a firm desire that the revised cost limitation for permanent barracks be utilized even though it may be necessary to scale back the number of troop accommodations actually constructed. The present administrative limitation of \$7,000 per man for bachelor officers quarters should be removed and the services be permitted to construct to criteria gaged to the statutory limitation.

Testimony before the Committee discloses that the Department of Defense plans to continue replacement of over-age facilities for troop housing and bachelor officer quarters in their military construction program for the years 1968 through 1972. During this period of time, they have programmed the construction of some 227,000 new barracks spaces and approximately 24,400 new bachelor officer quarters. The Committee will expect the fiscal year 1968 program, not only to contain a proper portion of these overall requirements, but to be based upon realistic

cost and space criteria which will provide adequate housing for our military personnel. In determining the total requirements for troop housing, bachelor officer, and enlisted personnel, consideration should certainly be given to allowing such personnel, particularly bachelor officers, warrant officers and bachelor enlisted personnel in the upper pay grades, to live off base in civilian accommodations, where such accommodations are adequate and readily available, either by private rental or government lease, and the personnel desire to take advantage of their availability, and it can be accomplished without unduly compromising the military assignments of such personnel.

Study should also be given to greater use of Section 810 housing, to permit construction of rental family housing units by private industry as well as to the possibility of inaugurating a program for the construction of rental bachelor officer quarters by private industry.

CONSTRUCTION PROGRAM FOR SOUTHEAST ASIA

The military construction program is an essential portion of our military operations in Southeast Asia. The nature of the terrain, the paucity of operational bases, the lack of natural ports and other supply and logistical facilities in South Vietnam has required a major construction effort to adequately support our military requirements. To a large extent, the construction of these facilities has been a pacing factor in the deployment of Allied forces and the conduct of military operations in this area. Nearly all of the facilities required by military units in this country have had to be provided, in most cases, under the most difficult conditions. Congress has appropriated \$1,013,600,000 in support of these construction effort in South Vietnam, basically through military construction programs contained in supplemental appropriations act. Additional funds have been made available through the Military Assistance Program.

The fiscal year 1967 program provides funds for Southeast Asia, solely for the construction of facilities in support of South Vietnam and non-U.S. Free World forces in that area. In prior years this type of construction was funded in the Military Assistance Program (MAP); however, beginning with the Supplemental Defense Appropriations Act, 1966 such facilities have been provided through military construction channels. If additional funds are required for support of United States troops in this area, they will be contained in subsequent supplemental appropriations acts. The necessity of close cooperation with the armed forces of South Vietnam and the other forces contributing to the defense effort in that country, and the general shortage of key facilities, call for close coordination and supervision of construction activities. The funds made available by the Committee include \$33,000,000 for the Army, \$1,400,000 for the Navy, and \$5,700,000 for the Air Force. Comparison with prior year programs is shown in the tabulation below:

Military assistance program construction program in Vietnam

	Fiscal year 1965	Fiscal year 1966	Fiscal year 1967
Army.....	\$22,410,000	\$46,561,000	\$33,000,000
Navy.....	6,300,000	7,540,000	1,400,000
Air Force.....	25,223,000	15,511,000	5,700,000
Total.....	53,933,000	69,612,000	40,100,000

The massive construction effort in South Vietnam required the buildup and utilization of construction contractors and troop labor on a scale unprecedented in such a small geographical area. Since September, 1965, the number of military construction battalions has increased from five to twenty-three and the number of civilian construc-

tion employees has increased from thirteen thousand to over fifty thousand. Waterfront piers, runways, air bases, warehouses, maintenance facilities, cantonment areas, and other facilities essential to the successful operation of our military effort in this country have been constructed and are now in use. More are being completed each month. The value of military construction in place at the end of July, 1966 was estimated at \$138,000,000. This is increasing at the present time at a rate in excess of \$40,000,000 per month and will continue to increase in the future. Although much remains to be done, a solid construction capability has been mobilized and facilities have been, and are continuing to be, completed in phase with operational requirements. That this has been accomplished in so short a period of time is a tribute to the civilian and military personnel involved in this program, particularly those at work in South Vietnam.

The implementation of a program of this magnitude, which demands speed as well as concurrent planning and construction of facilities, is fraught with management problems which demand prompt and continuing attention. Of primary concern must be the problem of program definition. The construction program in South Vietnam must support, to a large extent, a dynamic rather than a static operational situation. This, of course, makes definition of requirements most difficult. It is particularly true with reference to future requirements. Yet, if efficiency, as well as speed, is to be obtained in this construction program, steps must be taken to secure better program definition. Maximum and diligent effort must be continued to be made to define the facilities required for the successful prosecution of our military efforts in Vietnam and to provide the flexibility required to meet a changing military operation.

REQUIREMENT FOR INCREASED AUDIT PROGRAMS

The unprecedented size of the construction contract effort in South Vietnam and contract support for the entire construction program requires a major audit effort. Unfortunately, the audit of military contracts and activities in combat areas is difficult at best. The nature of the work, the combined use of troop and contractor labor, with the great dependence upon native help, accentuates the problem in South Vietnam. The Defense Contract Audit Agency, upon its establishment on July 1, 1965, assumed responsibility for the contract audit work and established a permanent staff in Saigon. This staff is being expanded. It is unfortunate that prior to the establishment of the Agency realistic audit activities were not being carried out. Testimony before the Committee discloses that steps are being taken to increase the nature and scope of the contract audits and to provide proper auditing support for this phase of the program. Since March the Agency has been operating a comprehensive audit program along scheduled lines. The Committee will expect that diligent attention will be given to this phase of the audit program and that it will continue to expand as required.

With respect to internal audits, in contrast to contract audits, the past practice of the Department of Defense has been to restrict these in combat areas so as to virtually preclude a comprehensive or realistic audit program. As a result, regularly constituted Army, Navy and Air Force audit agencies have functioned only in a minor role in the South Vietnam program. Properly so, this policy has now been changed and the three services are moving ahead on the development and implementation of comprehensive internal audit programs. Such programs are long overdue and the Department of Defense is rightly subjected to criticism for not changing its policy prior to this time. There is no desire on the part of this Committee to hamper military operations in

South Vietnam with administrative personnel, but audit and review functions are required to a larger extent here than ordinarily because of the scope and complexity of our activities. Prompt measures must be taken to see that audit and review functions are properly performed in areas where they will not interfere with combat operations or unnecessarily obstruct United States operations in South Vietnam.

Inherent in this expanded audit effort in this area is the necessity for proper coordination of these activities. This must be done if this expanded audit effort is to properly contribute to United States operations. Reliance cannot be placed merely on written regulations drafted under peace-time conditions and never tested in combat areas. The inherent difficulties of audits in Vietnam, including combat operations, short tours of duty, difficulty in obtaining personnel and other factors make it extremely important that audit activities be properly coordinated so that undesirable duplication and undue hampering of military operations is not incurred. The responsibility for audit activities in the Department of Defense is vested in the Assistant Secretary of Defense, Comptroller. The Committee will expect him to take whatever steps are required to formulate and maintain a proper and coordinated program in this area, which will realistically support other operations of the Department of Defense. It will further expect the Secretary to file with the Committee, not later than January 10, 1967, a report of his activities in this respect.

NEED FOR EVALUATION OF THE PRESENT ORGANIZATIONAL STRUCTURE OF THE DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE FOR MILITARY CONSTRUCTION AND ENGINEERING FUNCTIONS

The Committee is not convinced that proper attention is being given, even at this late date, by the top echelons of the Department of Defense to the management of the construction effort in Southeast Asia. Testimony before the Committee disclosed that the present Navy contract consortium was encouraged to mobilize to support a program considerably beyond that which is presently funded. While this mobilization was in progress, construction facilities originally programmed for this contract were removed from that program and placed under a separate contract. Other works, originally contemplated for the Navy contractors, have been assigned to the expanding troop construction forces. Thus, supply lines, procurement of equipment, and recruitment of personnel have been duplicated. These changes were made in an effort to speed up the construction program. But if such changes were justified, they should, for obvious reasons, have been made much earlier in the program. This would have insured better utilization of labor, equipment and material, and a lower total cost. It is easy to criticize decisions after they have been made and when hindsight is available. However, testimony before the Committee did not disclose that proper consideration was given at the time decisions for program changes were made, to utilizing the full capability of the existing Navy contract effort either to construct facilities or to provide necessary materials and items of equipment to others. The scale back came after the contractors had responded to demands for a buildup of personnel, equipment and materials. It is another case of lack of coordination.

The new contract employs a concept which is considerably different from that involved in construction elsewhere in the theatre, namely a "turn key" approach by which the contractor plans and constructs the entire job, and is responsible for securing all necessary equipment and supplies. The Committee does not prejudice this plan of construction, which might well prove to be an answer

to similar construction problems should they occur in the future at difficult and isolated locations. It is notable, however, that in the mid-1960's, despite the lessons of World War II and Korea, we seem to be little nearer to a coordinated pre-planned method for the construction of emergency military requirements than during those conflicts. It is disturbingly similar to a trial and error process. The problems in the construction effort in South Vietnam, as they relate to coordination and management, point up the necessity for an in-depth study by the Department of Defense of the construction organization best suited to meet the Defense needs of this country. The Committee calls upon the Department to take steps to initiate such a study, which will give consideration to construction requirements of the Department both in normal peacetime activities and during the exigencies and emergencies of war. The question of whether or not the present structure relating to the construction and engineering functions of the Department of Defense is a proper and valid one for a modern Defense force can no longer be ignored and must be made a matter of intensive and in-depth study by the Department.

Mr. CEDERBERG. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Chairman, I shall not take very much time on this bill, because the distinguished gentleman from Florida [Mr. Sikes], the chairman of the subcommittee, has done an excellent job in bringing up and presenting this bill to us and what it contains.

However, Mr. Chairman, there are a few points which I believe can be re-emphasized and some matters about which we ought to talk here this afternoon.

Mr. Chairman, I think—and if the Members of the Committee will refer to page 2 of this report they will find a comparison of the appropriations for the various services between the 1966 appropriations and those recommended in our bill.

Mr. Chairman, the Members of the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union will note a very drastic reduction in appropriations for all of the services for military construction.

As an example, in 1966 we appropriated \$269,268,000 for the Defense agencies. Yet, we recommended in this bill \$7,547,000, or a reduction of \$261,721,000.

Mr. Chairman, for the Department of the Army last year we appropriated \$843,143,000. This year we recommend \$146,406,000, or a reduction of \$696,737,000.

The Department of the Navy received \$580,405,000 last year, \$131,627,000 this year—a reduction of \$448,778,000.

For the Department of the Air Force, \$636,373,000 was appropriated last year. There is recommended in this bill, \$222,564,000—a reduction of \$413,809,000.

In family housing, \$665,846,000—recommended in this bill \$511,196,000—a reduction of \$154,650,000.

You can see what has happened here, all of these services have been substantially reduced.

Now, I am not one to complain about reducing appropriations. I am usually all for it. But I think we ought to recognize that drastic reductions in military construction will require, in the future, increased appropriations and bring about

increased costs. I am not sure that it is good business to reduce the expenditures of these agencies and these Departments of the Defense Department by so large an amount.

I only wish the President, when he presented the rest of his budget, had had as much concern about reducing the other areas of the budget as he seems to have had about reducing the military construction budget. Mr. Chairman, we find ourselves with a situation where the number of people going into service is increasing all the time and we need facilities to house them. Some are living in tents. Our facilities are getting older all the time.

The gentleman from Florida has explained that nonbudgeted items were not included in this bill. I see no reason to include them when the President says that he is not going to spend the money anyway. We have already had an unhappy experience with the fiscal year 1966 appropriation.

As you all know, there is no new family housing contemplated in this bill. The money for family housing is for debt payment and for operation and maintenance only.

There is currently deferred \$159,212,100 out of fiscal year 1966 funds, to provide 8,500 new family housing units for our military. The President's budget stated as have witnesses from the Department of Defense that these will be obligated in fiscal year 1967. We are growing further behind every year in meeting the requirements in this important category of construction.

It seems to me that we should recognize this housing deficiency as a fact. We certainly realize that in times of emergency we can cut some of these things, and the budget did do this. I wish, as I said before, that in other areas of our spending as much consideration had been given reducing the budget as they have in the military construction bill.

As you know, a year ago we were faced with a freeze of some \$620 million in appropriations for military construction. I have gone through the hearings. We on the committee had been assured, as the gentleman from Florida stated, that these were necessary items, that they were essential. Yet, after the appropriation was made, these funds were frozen.

I think that it is unfortunate and unnecessary to appropriate even this amount of money when we have these millions of dollars that remain unexpended and unobligated at the Pentagon.

Let me just give you some figures—and they are outlined in the report on page 2 under the heading "Funds available for obligation in fiscal year 1967."

If this bill is passed in present form we will have available for the Department of the Army, the Department of the Navy, the Department of the Air Force, and the defense agencies, a total for obligations of \$2,215,341,419.

The Reserve components of the Army, Navy, and Air Force will have available for obligation \$81,104,011.

Now, on page 3 of the report, you will see another table—and this table represents

funds available for expenditure in fiscal year 1967.

You will notice that available for expenditure the total is \$3,076,271,331. For the Reserve components, the total is \$95,917,754 unexpended.

Now, in my opinion this is just too much money to leave available at the Defense Department. I do not think it is good budgeting for us to come in here with this bill—although I support the bill and every item in it—to appropriate more money and leave this frozen money available to the Defense Department without requiring them to either expend it or apply it to these new projects.

May I say that since these projects were frozen, the cost of construction has gone up, according to testimony we heard a couple of weeks ago showed in varying amounts from 5 to 8 percent. This means one of two things: either we are going to have to cut the scope of these deferred projects, if they are going to be built, cut some corners, or we are going to have to come back and reappropriate additional funds to build these same projects.

We have lost, too, due to increasing costs, using the lower 5-percent cost increase figure, about \$30 million in increased construction costs on these \$600 million of deferred projects.

Mr. JONAS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CEDERBERG. I yield to the gentleman from North Carolina.

Mr. JONAS. It is also true that the justifications for the present projects are already over a year old?

Mr. CEDERBERG. That is certainly correct.

Mr. JONAS. The situations may be entirely different today than they were at the time these items were justified?

Mr. CEDERBERG. That is absolutely correct. These projects in almost all instances should be brought back in for review by Congress. We should require the services to come back in and rejustify them so that we could take another look at them. I see no reason why they should have these funds and not apply them to the expenditures listed here.

There is another situation which has occurred. At Fort Devens, Mass., and Fort Gordon, they have deferred troop housing which was in the 1966 bill. In the 1967 bill they have come in for troop housing at these very same locations. We granted that. We are for troop housing. We believe they need the 1966 housing and the 1967 housing. But it does not make much sense, in my opinion, not to require them to fund it out of some of the money available for the deferred 1966 projects.

I just want to alert the House as I told the gentleman from Florida, that we intend to offer an amendment that will do nothing more than this. It is not intended in any way to disturb the construction of any project in this bill, but only to see that the appropriation is reduced by \$300 million. That still gives them plenty of money to apply on this one. Then when they decide to release the 1966 deferred projects, they can come back and justify them to us and we will provide the necessary funds to do that

work. I think this makes sense. I think it makes sense, and to do otherwise, I would think, would be making a mockery of the appropriation procedure.

In closing, I want to refer, as did the Chairman, the distinguished gentleman from Florida, to our construction in Vietnam. The gentleman from Florida has very ably stated that this is a difficult area for construction. There is no question about it. There is no other nation in the world that could possibly take on this mammoth job and do it as we have done it. In my opinion, there have been some unnecessary costs and losses that have been incurred. If you read the hearings we have held and the comments in the report, you will see that we called it to the attention of the Defense Department that we are unhappy at their delay in providing the necessary audit procedures.

It seems to me that should have been one of the first things that was done. When you let a cost-plus-fixed-fee contract, that is the day you ought to have an auditor there from the day the contract is let, because there is always the tendency in a cost-plus-fixed-fee project to have a sloppy management.

It may be of some interest to you to know that this contract or this combine, I should say, is due to be scheduled out or phased out around October of 1967. If this project is phased out, then it is the intention of the military to use our own construction troops to carry on the in-country construction.

I say this is well, but if by 1967, when this project is about to phase out, we find it is still necessary, because of changing conditions over there, that a contract must continue by other than military construction units, it seems to me there ought to be enough experience in Vietnam by that time so that we can get away from this cost-plus-fixed-fee contract and go to competitive bidding. We are doing that in Thailand and in some of the other areas. I would hope that this can be done.

I commend this bill to the Members. I think it is a bare-bones bill for the necessities of our armed services. I commend it to the Members for adoption.

Mr. SIKES. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may require to the distinguished gentleman from California, the chairman of the Science and Astronautics Committee.

(By unanimous consent, Mr. MILLER was allowed to proceed out of order.)

Mr. MILLER. Mr. Chairman, the first 2 days of the 3-day Gemini 11 mission of Astronauts Charles Conrad, Jr., and Richard F. Gordon, Jr., have resulted in significant advances in space operations and new understanding of the space environment. During the first revolution on Monday the accomplishment of rendezvous and docking was a vital step in developing the ability to carry out this necessary procedure on the return from the moon before the end of this decade. Astronaut Gordon's activities in free space—44 minutes yesterday and 2 hours and 16 minutes today—have provided experience that underlines the necessity for much more experimentation in this new

realm. And for more than 3 hours early this morning the spacecraft was in an orbit that reached an altitude of 850 miles above the earth, the highest man has ever reached. The Gemini 11 mission constitutes a major forward step in the progress toward our objectives in space.

Mr. ARENDS. Mr. Chairman, I make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair will count.

Seventy-eight Members are present, not a quorum.

The Clerk will call the roll.

The Clerk called the roll, and the following Members failed to answer to their names:

[Roll No. 282]

Abbitt	Green, Oreg.	Reld, N.Y.
Abernethy	Hagan, Ga.	Reinecke
Albert	Hansen, Idaho	Resnick
Andrews	Hansen, Wash.	Rogers, Tex.
Glenn	Hawkins	Roncallo
Aspinall	Hébert	Roybal
Barrett	Helstoski	St Germain
Belcher	Hicks	Senner
Boland	Holland	Sickles
Bolling	Horton	Sisk
Broomfield	Irwin	Smith, Calif.
Clark	Jones, N.C.	Stephens
Clevenger	Karsh	Stratton
Colmer	King, N.Y.	Teague, Tex.
Conable	Kluczynski	Thompson, N.J.
Corman	Landrum	Todd
Curtin	McMillan	Toll
Davis, Ga.	Macdonald	Trimble
Dent	Martin, Ala.	Tuten
Devine	Martin, Mass.	Udall
Dickinson	Mills	Van Deerlin
Diggs	Moorhead	Vigorito
Dorn	Morris	Walker, Miss.
Edmondson	Morrison	Walker, N. Mex.
Evans, Colo.	Murray	Weltner
Fallon	O'Hara, Mich.	Whalley
Farnstein	O'Konski	White, Idaho
Farnsley	O'Neill, Mass.	Willis
Fisher	Passman	Wilson, Bob
Flynt	Pelly	Wilson,
Fogarty	Pepper	Charles H.
Friedel	Powell	Zablocki
Gallagher	Quile	
Garmatz	Rees	

Accordingly, the Committee rose; and the Speaker having resumed the chair, Mr. ULLMAN, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union, reported that that Committee, having had under consideration the bill H.R. 17637, and finding itself without a quorum, he had directed the roll to be called, when 330 Members responded to their names, a quorum, and he submitted herewith the names of the absentees to be spread upon the Journal.

The Committee resumed its sitting.

Mr. CEDERBERG. Mr. Chairman, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from Maryland [Mr. MORTON].

Mr. MORTON. Mr. Chairman, first let me say to my colleagues in the Committee that I had nothing to do with requesting the quorum call. However, I am delighted that we have as many here as we have.

I have become very much concerned about some of the phases of military management which have led us to the appropriations bill which we have under consideration today. We have heard much about the closing of bases and the transfer of facilities from one area to another.

Not long ago it was announced by the Navy that a large recruit training center

was to be established, supplementing the activities at Great Lakes and at San Diego on the west coast. It was to be established at Bainbridge, Md., at the naval training center there. This was the result of a study made by the Navy, which I believe was completed in 1964. This study was comprehensive in nature. It pointed up the fact that an additional recruit training center was needed and also it pointed up the fact that Bainbridge was the logical place to put it.

Not long after that, it was announced that this recruit training center was to be put, not at Bainbridge, but was to be put somewhere else in the country. This change of decision was justified, I assume, by the management people who make such decisions in the Navy. But, in addition to this, it was decided that a great many other facilities which now exist at Bainbridge would also be transferred from Bainbridge to other areas of the country.

One of these is the Women's Training Center which trains the Waves. It was only a few months before this decision that the necessary funds were authorized and appropriated for the Navy to build a \$1.2 million barracks for the Waves at Bainbridge, which is now under construction and which I assume will not be needed or will not be used when the Waves are transferred away.

The concern is this: We know we have to invest large sums in construction at a very high cost in places like Vietnam. We know that we have to establish new facilities for new types of programs that are developed through the development of new weapons systems and new military concepts. This is an investment we must make.

But it seems to me that in this incidence we are looking at an area of gross mismanagement. For no apparent military reason we begin to play checkers with military facilities at great cost. This concerns me and should concern every Member of Congress and should concern every American citizen. At no time in the history of this country—at no time—have we put a greater proportion of our financial energy, our tax money, into military operations than we are doing today. Therefore, it seems to me that every penny spent should be carefully scrutinized and should be carefully evaluated as to necessity and priority.

Here we had an elaborate study, which indicated one specific course of action for the Navy to take. Here in a matter of weeks, this was abandoned and another course of action was taken, the total cost of which will require the investment by taxpayers of about \$14.9 million.

It is hard to argue that a military base should be kept open just because it is in one's district or one's State. Bainbridge, frankly, happens to be in my district in the State of Maryland. But it is easy to argue that in these times investments made by the military in permanent construction facilities should be weighed, and weighed carefully, before they are requested by the Department of Defense and appropriated by the Congress.

I should like to quote from page 5 of the report, with reference to the fiscal year 1966 program:

The Congress approved this program relying specifically on a letter from the Secretary of Defense to the Committee on Appropriations of the House of Representatives dated July 31, 1965 which stated:

"In the case of the current program, you may be assured that each item has been stringently reviewed and there is no request for construction funds at any base likely to be declared excess within the foreseeable future with one exception."

Mr. MATHIAS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MORTON. I yield to the gentleman from Maryland.

Mr. MATHIAS. I should like to say at this point, I believe the distinguished gentleman from Maryland's First District does not have to apologize for the fact that he is speaking about a facility which is within his own district. It is true that perhaps a large percentage of the jobs involved do involve people who live in the First District of Maryland, but the money which is involved in replacement facilities in some other part of the country and the money which is going to be lost by the abandonment of these important facilities which already exist at Bainbridge is money which comes out of the pockets of the constituents of every Member of the House. It comes out of the General Treasury. This is something in which we are all interested.

I believe the gentleman is doing a signal service to the House and to this legislation by discussing an important item of this sort which involves a tremendous amount of money and which, even more important, goes to the efficient management to our Defense Establishment.

I wish to associate myself with the remarks of the gentleman from Maryland, because this is a great contribution on this particular item.

Mr. MORTON. I thank the gentleman.

What the Secretary said—and I am paraphrasing the letter I have quoted—was that there would be no investment in facilities which were not necessary. Obviously here we are not living up to this clear statement of policy.

We are building a Wave barracks at a cost of \$1.2 million at Bainbridge, and are going to move the Waves away before they have time to occupy the barracks, is that good management? I question it.

There has been no suggestion by the Navy as to what facilities are going to be put into Bainbridge to take the place or to occupy the area which is now occupied by such facilities as our Nuclear Training School, electronics schools, the Wave Training Center, and so forth.

If Bainbridge were being closed up entirely, and there were great savings that could be pointed out, this would be a different proposition, but Bainbridge is hard core, so the Navy states—and it should be. It is an old, permanent, well-located facility. Savings have not been demonstrated as a result of these moves

by the Navy in the hearings before the Appropriations Committee.

I believe my colleague, the gentleman from Maryland [Mr. LONG], will point out some of the things that were said concerning this very proposition in the Committee on Appropriations.

The point I am trying to make is that at a time when management should be the keynote of military operations, here is a case of mismanagement.

I hope that the great Committee on Appropriations and I hope that this body will see fit to review in the process of this legislation this case of careless decision.

We are going to offer an amendment which will reduce this appropriation by the amount of money that is being used to create facilities for those operations which are at Bainbridge and which are to be moved by the Navy.

In closing just let me say this: At a time when we are spending over 50 percent of all of the revenues that come in to the Federal Government in order to maintain our defense posture and to carry out our commitments overseas, at such a time we should, above all other times, be frugal in our investment in facilities which are long term in nature and which can be deferred to a future date without impairing our military posture. No real military reason has been given to justify the transfer of these facilities from Bainbridge to other areas of the country. Therefore, I think this appropriation is unjustified.

Mr. SIKES. Mr. Chairman, I yield 15 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Maryland, a member of the committee [Mr. LONG].

Mr. LONG of Maryland. Thank you, Mr. Chairman, for yielding this time.

I have listened with great interest to the comments of my able colleague from the First District of Maryland [Mr. MORTON], and I want to say that anything I have to say today does not detract in any way from the admiration which I hold for the chairman of my subcommittee, the gentleman from Florida [Mr. SIKES], and the chairman of the full Committee on Appropriations, the gentleman from Texas [Mr. MAHON], who I think are extremely able gentlemen. I have sat and watched with admiration now for the short time I have been on the committee the painstaking, careful, and conscientious work they do in handling these appropriation items.

Nevertheless, I want to take strong exceptions to that part of this military construction appropriation bill which undertakes to vote an initial \$14.9 million to establish a third recruit naval training center, the location of which has not yet been determined. I oppose this funding on a number of important grounds.

In the first place, I feel that the Navy does not really want this operation moved away from Bainbridge to Orlando, Fla., which is apparently the unofficial destination of this third naval recruit training center. I think that the Navy indicated it does not want this by reason of a sequence of flip-flops on the part of the Navy. A Navy study of October 1964—and I think the time sequence is

important—October 1964 showed that Orlando was incapable of accommodating activities presently carried on at Bainbridge. Furthermore, it recommended reactivation of Bainbridge for a male recruit training center with an 8,000 capacity.

I quote this study:

This survey concluded that there would be no gain to the Government in either monetary savings or in improvement to the national defense posture as a result of the proposed action to relocate Bainbridge training activities to Orlando. The survey group also concluded that the facilities and space at the proposed relocation site at Orlando could not accommodate the present training that was being conducted at Bainbridge. It was recommended that Bainbridge be retained with its current mission and that plans should be made to reactivate male recruit training at Bainbridge with an on-board load of 8,000 recruits.

On April 14, 1965, 6 months later, naval officials again testified before the Military Construction Subcommittee that a third recruit training center was needed and out of 10 sites studied none were as acceptable as Bainbridge.

They listed the sites, which ranged all the way from Lincoln Air Force Base in Nebraska and Schilling Air Force Base to Orlando.

Now, Mr. Chairman, it will be argued by some of the members of the committee, that at this time it was not known that Orlando would be closed.

Now, Mr. Chairman, I say at that time it was known that Orlando was to be closed, and on page 834 of the hearings I want to read the testimony as follows:

Mr. SIKES. Would the fact that a new base closing order comes out subsequent to these hearings, enter into the situation?

Mr. BALDWIN. They certainly would enter into it, although we knew prior to this that Orlando was going to be available.

Now, Mr. Chairman, the argument that Navy people learned all of a sudden that Orlando was going to lose its Air Force base and thus they would have a facility, does not hold water in view of that statement.

Mr. Chairman, on April 14, 1965, shortly after this, Admiral Hull in the hearings of April 1965 stated that—

The Navy's position is that Bainbridge is very definitely hard core; it is in the right place and we want to bring it up to date so that it will compare favorably with Great Lakes and San Diego; and, all three are needed.

Then, Mr. Chairman, in June 1965, the Bureau of Navy Personnel approved Bainbridge as a logical choice for a third boot camp.

Mr. Chairman, I want to read from that testimony. It considered that Bainbridge was substandard in some respects as a naval training center.

Yet, Mr. Chairman, we are going to be told that that place is just one dilapidated mess. But, here the Department of the Navy knew about it for some period of time as a naval training center and that its layout better lent itself to modernization and expansion than did those of other institutions with totally different missions.

Those are the four statements which have been made by the Department of

the Navy, and all of a sudden in 1965 the Secretary of the Department of the Navy ordered a new study and for 2 months after that this study was carried on and as a result thereof, the Secretary of Defense announced that both the recruit camp and the other should be located at Orlando.

Mr. Chairman, I submit that they do not want to make any decision. They were told to make it. Somebody up there—somebody up there—told them to make it.

Now, Mr. Chairman, the argument that they gave is that a couple of factors were not known at the time that they made this flip-flop. One of them is that they decided it would cost a lot less to put it at Orlando than it would at Bainbridge.

Second, Mr. Chairman, they claimed that since a lot of housing is going to be opened up at Orlando as a result of the closing of the Orlando base, that this made it \$13 million cheaper because of the housing that they could get at Orlando.

Mr. Chairman, I submit to the Members of the Committee on the Whole House on the State of the Union that it was known that Orlando was going to be available. They will tell you that Sanford was closed some time after that, but I point out that Sanford released only 800 additional homes, and according to the spokesman on the part of the Department of the Navy they already had plenty of homes at the time they thought Orlando was not suitable.

Mr. SIKES. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LONG of Maryland. I would like to complete my statement and then I shall yield to the gentleman from Florida if I have the time.

Mr. CEDERBERG. If the gentleman desires additional time, I shall be happy to yield that additional time to the gentleman.

Mr. SIKES. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LONG of Maryland. I yield to the gentleman from Florida.

Mr. SIKES. Mr. Chairman, I have the highest regard for my good friend, the gentleman from Maryland [Mr. Long], and I do not want to interfere with his train of thought. However, it just occurred to me that the gentleman was pointing rather high when he was pointing "up there."

Mr. CHELF. He did not mean the Lord, I will tell the gentleman that.

Mr. SIKES. That is the point.

Mr. LONG of Maryland. Thank you, my Lord Chairman.

Mr. Chairman, I point out that all of this housing was known about and the pretense that there was some extra housing that became available was not really the factor. But I point out, however, that if the housing were a factor and that this made the \$13 million cost differential, the Department of the Navy has indicated it does not figure it to the extent of \$33 million.

For one thing, they have to make it seem to cost a lot more to build the operation at Bainbridge. They have given

us a lot of phony figures which do not square with the construction costs just a few miles away as established by the Department of Defense at Aberdeen. And I tell you that the figures are phony also because there has been very little construction up there. They do not really know what the construction figures are.

Second, the cost of construction at Bainbridge is padded by items that are seldom seen in a construction program. A bank, for example, a golf course, an education center, a thrift shop, a youth center, child care centers, community center, \$1.2 million are padded into these expenditures.

Next, \$1 million extra will be involved in recruit travel to Orlando compared with Bainbridge, by the Navy's own admission. And they admitted that this would probably go on for 10 years, so you can reasonably figure \$10 million for that item.

Then you have the cost of \$2.5 million to relocate the command school and WAVE center from Bainbridge to Orlando, and another \$3.5 million for married quarters allowance.

When they came back with the study a couple of years ago, they said that they had to rehabilitate the mess hall, and it would be just as good as it ever was, and now they come along and say that they are moving to Orlando, and want to tear it down. If they put it at Bainbridge they would not have to build a brandnew facility.

The Navy, when I quizzed them in the hearings, were not able to offer very good reasons.

The other item that they gave was the weather. They say that the weather is better in Florida than it is in Maryland. Well, I do not think, as a matter of fact, that we ought to be spending \$100 million—and that is what this is going to cost before we are through—to move a base from one perfect climate to another perfect climate. And if the Florida climate is perfect, then so is the climate in Maryland. Each one has its defects, when you come down to it, they just happen to be a long distance apart.

The commander of the training center at Bainbridge said—that in his opinion climate should not be a factor for serious consideration in any decision which would rule out Bainbridge as a possible site for the proposed recruit training camp, since the training activities including drilling could be carried on indoors during inclement weather, and no training time would be lost.

The Navy says that another factor is health. The Navy says that the Florida climate would be more healthful than Maryland's climate.

Let me show you what the commander of the training center at Bainbridge said—this is the Navy's own testimony—

The commander of NTC Bainbridge advised the staff that, in his opinion, climate should not be a factor for serious consideration in any decision which would rule out Bainbridge as a possible site for the proposed recruit training camp, since training activity, including drilling, could be carried on indoors during inclement weather and no training time would be lost.

They say that not only is weather a factor, but also health, and say that the Florida climate would be more healthful than Maryland's climate. Let me read here from what the commander NTC, Bainbridge, said:

The commander fully advised that there has never been an epidemic of any serious proportion at Bainbridge. * * * In a Navy study conducted in 1964 it was reported that "22 years of practical experience at NTC, Bainbridge, indicates negligible incidence of respiratory diseases".

When I pointed this out to the Secretary of the Navy all he could come up with was that "I am the Secretary of the Navy. I have to place my judgment above that of the commander at Bainbridge." We were not asking for his judgment, we were asking for the facts, and these are the facts.

Now, I want to point out that Bainbridge is already an operating training center. If we wanted to introduce a new setup, a new recruit training camp, we can set it up there with a minimum of disruption in 3 to 6 months. It has been a boot camp before. All it needs is to be reactivated, and this could be done in 3 to 6 months.

You are talking about the buildings not being in good shape. Well, they have some buildings up there that are in good shape, as well as some that are in bad shape.

Here is a room where the Waves are now operating. Here is another room, and it shows all kinds of boxes and junk lying around. They are both the same type of building, built at the same time. One just happens to have been kept up, and the other one let go. There is not anything in that building there that could not be made good in a few months, and it would be just as good as this other building that I showed you that is currently in operation.

If we take the Navy training facilities out of Bainbridge and take them down to Orlando there is going to be real loss of facilities at Bainbridge. The saddest thing of all, is that, when we were told that Bainbridge was hard core, our committee and the Committee on Armed Services voted \$1.25 million for a Waves barracks at Bainbridge.

I want to show you this picture. Here is the Waves barracks. It has still 10 percent to go as far as construction before it is finished, and the decision has been made to move the Waves out of Bainbridge and down to Orlando. At the same time there is \$2 million worth of rehabilitation of housing in the area going on for a base that we propose to move out of Bainbridge and down to Florida.

In addition, the \$14.9 million will simply add to the large sum of appropriated funds which the Department of Defense has seen fit to defer.

The gentleman from Michigan [Mr. CEDERBERG] has pointed out that we already have \$600 million worth of deferred expenditures, money that we have appropriated that has not been spent yet. I do not think we ought to add any more.

This \$14.9 million is only the first installment on \$100 million altogether. I

think we ought to hold off the expenditure until they have spent the money we have already given them.

When Wherry housing and the Wave barracks were started, they were started the very month that the Navy decided to move the operations out of Bainbridge to Orlando. If we had forced the Navy to come to our committee from time to time when they wanted money, we would have found out what they were proposing to do at the very moment they were deciding to move out of Bainbridge to Orlando, that they were proposing to put \$3.5 million into new construction there. This is what happens when you defer items and lose control over expenditures.

I want to point out further that this third Naval Recruit Training Center is a long-range project. Do not let anyone tell you that we need it right now. The first group of recruits is supposed to move into it in 1968 and the second group in 1970, and much of the move will not be completed until 1974. That is the most pessimistic view of the war in Vietnam I have seen yet. This project is for the Vietnam war or it is not. I do not think anyone maintains it is. If it is not, then we should not be undertaking a long-range project in the middle of a war, a war whose duration we cannot foresee, and which may involve all sorts of things we cannot decide about yet.

I think we ought to be putting all military expenditures into this war, and additional funds should be diverted into other projects. The President himself has urged that all unnecessary appropriations should be cut back.

Finally, the authorization bill does not specify the location. We are asked to vote \$14.9 million and we are not told where it is going to be spent. Unofficially, we are told Orlando. Officially, we are told, "We will give you the money, and then you come back later and tell us where you are going to put it." I say this is wrong.

I do not think the Congress should relinquish legislative oversight over the Navy's decisions. I think this is what happens when you let appropriations go through for an unspecified location. By allowing the Navy to choose the site for an installation after we have appropriated the funds, Congress loses its function as overseer of expenditures. I do not think we make up for that by telling the Department, "You come back next year and tell us what you have decided."

For this reason I plan later to offer an amendment to subtract the \$14.9 million from this bill. I think it is time that we took such action.

I have noticed since I have been on the Appropriations Committee and since I have been in Congress that a lot of fine things have been said about cutting expenditures. Everyone gets up and orates. But every time you come to a specific item, they will turn pale and beat a steady retreat.

I shall offer an amendment relating to a specific item.

Mr. MORTON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LONG of Maryland. I yield to the gentleman from Maryland.

Mr. MORTON. I want to commend the gentleman for what I think has been

the most lucid explanation of this Bainbridge project I have ever heard. I would like to ask this question of you as a member of the Appropriations Committee: What justification did the Navy give for the moving of the facilities that are already there? I understand the justification they gave for not going through with the recruit training center at Bainbridge and transferring it elsewhere, but what justification did they have for moving the Waves, the schools, and the other installations that they intended to move away? This I have never been able to ferret out.

Mr. LONG of Maryland. This is still a mystery to me, Mr. MORTON. I have not been able to find out either.

I would guess that it would simply be nice to have the Waves in the same camps with the "boots." Since we decided to put the "boots" at Florida, it would be nice to have the Waves close by there, too. That is the only justification I can find.

Mr. MORTON. That does not seem enough justification to me to pay \$14.9 million.

Mr. LONG of Maryland. Nor to me.

Mr. SIKES. Mr. Chairman, I am very pleased to yield 5 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from South Carolina, the chairman of the great House Committee on Armed Services.

Mr. RIVERS of South Carolina. Mr. Chairman, I thank the distinguished gentleman from Florida for giving me this time.

I take this time to inquire of the distinguished chairman of the subcommittee about the items on page 16, which have been deleted, aggregating some \$42,218,000. I notice it is the intention of the committee to urge—that is of the full committee and of the subcommittee—that plans be completed on these projects totaling the amount to which I have just referred. I should like to ask the chairman if this is a fact. Are sufficient funds included within this appropriation to take care of any necessary planning money for these projects?

Mr. SIKES. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RIVERS of South Carolina. I would like the gentleman to answer the question, and I will be glad to yield to him for an answer.

Mr. SIKES. Mr. Chairman, I would be very pleased to answer my friend's question. First, if I may, I would like to say, as I have said many times in the past, that I believe the contribution of the gentleman from South Carolina and his Committee on Armed Services to the military personnel of our country are among the most outstanding in our time, if not the most outstanding.

I consider the Nation is greatly indebted for his leadership and that of his committee in this important work.

Now, with reference to the specific question which the gentleman asked, let me quote from page 17 of the committee report on this bill. Speaking for the committee, I quote:

It will expect the Department of Defense to complete the preparation of plans and specifications for these line items and to include them in future military construction

programs if they remain as valid military construction requirements.

The term "line items" mean non-budget items.

May I say there is sufficient planning money, \$43.9 million, carried in this bill which would be available. There also is unobligated planning money from prior appropriations. There is no doubt of this whatever. Each of the services has assured me personally that there is adequate money to complete this planning. Most of these projects have had little or no planning done on them. This necessarily means delays. It is my hope that these projects will be rapidly funded, because I consider most of them valid and needed military requirements.

Mr. RIVERS of South Carolina. I thank the gentleman.

I want to say this, Mr. Chairman, these items which have been deleted have been gone into very carefully in our committee. They are vital to the war effort. They are vital to the military. They should never have been deleted by the Department of Defense in the first instance. The services want every single one of them. I cannot decide which of them is the most important, because each department has a number of them.

I recall vividly the hospital in Massachusetts and the Wright Patterson Air Force Base, which are vital institutions. The executive department is taking it out of the hide of the military, and the DOD must now take the brunt of the burden of these deletions. I hate to see us establish a precedent here, or a policy, of not appropriating money because we are fearful the executive branch will not expend this money.

I believe our responsibility is to resist. We should fulfill our own responsibility.

I hope this is not a precedent that if we have a conjecture that the executive branch may not expend funds we then will not make them available. This is not a wise course to follow. We must carry out what is good for efficiency in the operation of our military, regardless of what the executive branch might do.

I would hate to think we would do that. I hope the great Committee on Appropriations will not regard this as a precedent, so in the future if we get a word from the executive branch that they may not expend money then accordingly we will not make it available. We should fulfill our responsibility and let the executive department fulfill its own responsibility.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from South Carolina has expired.

Mr. SIKES. Mr. Chairman, I yield the gentleman 2 additional minutes.

Mr. RIVERS of South Carolina. Mr. Chairman, we are going to insist, in our committee, that these projects be carried out. The \$600 million which the Secretary, in his infinitesimal wisdom, cut back last year, was ridiculous. It is affecting the war effort. It is affecting our capacity to wage war against our enemy. It is affecting the morale of our military. It is affecting America, and it should not be countenanced.

I am delighted to hear the distinguished chairman of the subcommittee

of the Appropriations Committee say that he also agrees these things should be funded forthwith. I know he will carry out his promise to insist on it.

Mr. CEDERBERG. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RIVERS of South Carolina. If I have time I will yield. Will the gentleman yield me a minute?

Mr. CEDERBERG. I yield the gentleman 2 minutes.

We are going to offer an amendment on this side which will have one purpose, which is to unfreeze some of these funds frozen last year, so that they can be used. Then, when they need further funds, they can come in and get all the funds they need and that can be justified. It is designed not to in any way cripple any facility.

Mr. RIVERS of South Carolina. I say to the distinguished gentleman, I will help him on any amendment he has to increase this bill.

Mr. CEDERBERG. I will tell the gentleman what we are going to do.

Mr. RIVERS of South Carolina. Will the gentleman answer my question?

Mr. CEDERBERG. To support funds to increase the bill?

Mr. RIVERS of South Carolina. No? Then I cannot take more time. The gentleman is just talking.

Mr. CEDERBERG. I am perfectly willing to support an amendment.

Mr. RIVERS of South Carolina. The gentleman does not have any notion of increasing this bill, and he is just talking, knocking me off the track.

Mr. CEDERBERG. We cannot increase this bill above the authorization.

Mr. RIVERS of South Carolina. We can increase it \$42,218,000.

Mr. CEDERBERG. We cannot put unbudgeted items in here.

Mr. RIVERS of South Carolina. Who cannot?

Mr. CEDERBERG. The President says he will not spend the money, anyway.

Mr. RIVERS of South Carolina. The gentleman is succumbing to the thing I am talking about. The gentleman ought to be ashamed of himself.

Mr. CEDERBERG. Well—

Mr. RIVERS of South Carolina. I do not yield further. The gentleman gets me all mixed up.

Mr. SIKES. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RIVERS of South Carolina. I yield to the chairman of the subcommittee.

Mr. SIKES. May I point out that earlier in the discussion today this situation was made relatively clear. The significant point is that there is very little likelihood that this money could be spent if it were appropriated this year.

I do feel that the projects, in almost all instances, are valid and needed projects, and I shall support their construction at the earliest possible time.

Mr. RIVERS of South Carolina. I wish to say here, Mr. Chairman, with the backing of the House, the Armed Services Committee is going to continue to follow an independent course, whether the executive branch likes it or not, and we are going to authorize funds when we

find them justified, because the military is being cut to the bone. We are tied down by a little country out in far southeast Asia. What if we got into a first class war? Do we know whether or not the military could carry on under this austere McNamara program? I do not know. I do not know, and I am worried about it.

Mr. Chairman, I include at this point the material that I previously referred to:

ARMY

U.S. Military Academy, New York: Various projects, \$2,451,000.

Fort Wolters, Tex.: Academic building, \$1,026,000.

Fort Richardson, Alaska: Coal to gas conversion, \$813,000.

Fort Dix, N.J.: Training ranges, reduction from \$1,914,000 to \$1,850,000.

NAVY

Naval Shipyard, Portsmouth, N.H.: Operational facility and utilities, \$295,000.

Naval Shipyard, Boston, Mass.: Deficiency appropriation for drydock No. 5, \$2,983,000.

Naval Hospital, Chelsea, Mass.: \$9,300,000.

Naval Hospital, Memphis, Tenn.: \$6,613,000.

Naval Aviation Station, Memphis, Tenn.: Training building, \$1,188,000.

Naval Supply Center, Puget Sound, Wash.: Conversion of commissary, \$404,000; relocation of facilities reduced from \$536,000 to \$198,000.

AIR FORCE

Hill Air Force Base, Nev.: Test range, \$876,000.

Tinker Air Force Base, Okla.: Officers quarters, \$956,000.

Wright-Patterson Air Force Base, Ohio: Engineering test laboratory, \$525,000; bachelor officers quarters, \$727,000.

Tyndall Air Force Base, Fla.: Numerous projects, \$1,280,000.

Arnold Engineering Development Center, Tenn.: Airfield, \$1,861,000.

Elmendorf Air Force Base, Alaska: Coal to gas conversion, \$900,000.

Travis Air Force Base, Calif.: Fleet service facility, \$374,000.

Goodfellow Air Force Base, Tex.: Service club, \$493,000.

Dover Air Force Base, Del.: Sewage disposal plant, \$250,000.

Malmstrom Air Force Base, Mont.: Various projects, \$1,618,000.

Holloman Air Force Base, N. Mex.: Maintenance hangar, \$1,447,000.

Lowry Air Force Base, Colo.: Supply and procurement training facility, reduction from \$1,736,000 to \$1,500,000.

George Air Force Base, Calif.: Headquarters facilities, \$292,000.

Cannon Air Force Base, N. Mex.: Land purchases, \$1,284,000.

Air Force Academy, Colo.: Total program reduced from \$10,758,000 to \$10,500,000.

Kunsan Air Base, Korea: Terminal facility, \$196,000.

Wheeler Air Base, Libya: Classified project, \$340,000.

Western test range, California: Classified projects, \$2,100,000.

Offutt Air Force Base, Nebr.: Headquarters facility, \$560,000.

Total of combined Army, Navy, and Air Force cost is as follows:

Army	\$4,354,000
Navy	21,121,000
Air Force	16,743,000
Total	42,218,000

Mr. CEDERBERG. Mr. Chairman, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. JONAS].

Mr. JONAS. Mr. Chairman, the distinguished chairman of the Committee on Armed Services here has just engaged in a colloquy with the chairman of our subcommittee, which I listened to with great interest. I would like to say to him that if he can take any action in his committee or if he can suggest any action that this House can take that will compel the Secretary of Defense to unfreeze the projects that have been funded in previous appropriation bills, I will be glad to support his efforts. We have tried in our committee to see that this is done. I know that the Committee on Armed Services has tried, but so far as I am able to determine, neither committee has succeeded. I am afraid neither committee is going to succeed so long as the present Secretary of Defense remains in charge.

Why, Mr. Chairman, we were told a year ago and I read now from a letter that our committee received from the Secretary of Defense which can be found on page 5 of the committee report:

In the case of the current program you may be assured that each item has been stringently reviewed and there is no request for construction funds at any base likely to be declared excess within the foreseeable future with one exception. At the Naval Shipyard, Portsmouth, New Hampshire, we have approximately \$1.0 million in the current program for construction of a radio-logical control facility essential to the ship overhaul scheduled there during the ten-year phaseout period. Please be assured that our objective is to insure that line items now being requested are limited to those bases with an assured hard core mission for the five-year program, fiscal year 1966 to fiscal year 1970.

In spite of those assurances and relying on them and relying on testimony given before the committee by service witnesses and despite the fact that we appropriated a substantial sum of money, the Secretary of Defense, before the ink was dry on the legislation, saw fit to freeze—I call it “freeze” and he calls it “defer”—the construction of military projects involving, as the gentleman well knows, \$600 million.

Now, the thing that I cannot understand about that is that \$160 million of that sum had been earmarked to build 8,500 family housing units for military personnel. I do not believe that he would have assumed the responsibility for doing that without administration support and approval. Despite the fact that funds to construct necessary, needed, and required family housing units in the number of 8,500 were approved, the Secretary of Defense chose not to build this housing. At that very time the administration was up here pleading with the Congress to inaugurate a brandnew program to subsidize the rent of civilians, and Congress approved it—not with your vote nor with mine. Does the gentleman from South Carolina recall that, and can he see any justification for such gross discrimination against the men who wear the uniform of our country?

Mr. RIVERS of South Carolina. Mr. Chairman, if the gentleman will yield, I think it is not only discriminating, but it is disgraceful. Do you know why they took it out of the hide of the military? They did it because the military cannot

talk back. The civilian economy is building over 1.1 million units of housing. Yet this little paltry 8,500 units that we authorized for the military, for the families of the men who have gone to the front, was cut back. Do you know why? They had nobody to speak for them in the highest councils of our Government.

Mr. Chairman, the man—that man—appointed to do that did not do it. He simply did not do it. He was more interested in turning over a military base across the river here to these professional paupers than he was in building houses to shelter the dependents and the families of those whose husbands have gone to war to keep this country free.

Mr. Chairman, I say to you that our Committee on Armed Services has stopped that kind of plunder.

Mr. Chairman, the military waited on the nuclear frigates. It waited on the base closures. If you will recall, the Congress now has to be in session continuously before the Secretary could close these bases without giving us proper notice.

Mr. Chairman, we worked day and night to find out how to stop this matter, and we are making progress—we are making progress.

Mr. JONAS. Mr. Chairman, I appreciate the comments of the distinguished chairman of the Committee on Armed Services who has been fighting this battle valiantly and who has received the assistance of many Members of this House.

Frankly, Mr. Chairman, I find it difficult to understand the thinking of those who seem to believe that the men in uniform should make all of the sacrifices involved in this war in Vietnam. They are not only doing the fighting, but they are leaving their homes, their loved ones, their possessions and their occupations, and are risking their lives.

Now, Mr. Chairman, their own Government is discriminating against them when the Congress appropriates money to build some housing for their families, and the Secretary of Defense and the administration freezes it and does not build that housing. And to add insult to injury, at the same time and almost in the same breath, the administration is up here asking Congress to inaugurate a plan, a new program, to subsidize the rent of certain civilians.

Mr. Chairman, I just do not believe that is fair.

Mr. RIVERS of South Carolina. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JONAS. Of course I yield further to the gentleman from South Carolina.

Mr. RIVERS of South Carolina. That is why I hate to see the great Committee on Appropriations do the same thing with reference to new hospitals contained in this bill and with reference to new barracks and the other things that we authorized.

Mr. Chairman, I do not believe we should fall into the same thing. Let them be criticized for their dereliction of duty, and not us. This is what I mean.

Mr. JONAS. I would say to the gentleman from South Carolina with respect

to that, that it has already been established that Congress cannot compel the spending of appropriated money or we have not been able to do it thus far.

But, one must remember also that when the money appropriated in this bill and with the funds available that have not been expended, the Department of Defense will have \$3 billion available for spending which it can spend next year.

But, Mr. Chairman, the gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. RIVERS], knows as well as I know that the President is not going to spend that much money. He has already indicated that he would not expend any money appropriated above his budget. The items in question were not budgeted. They are not ready to proceed. And I do not believe if the funds should be appropriated that they would be obligated next year. The President has made that crystal clear.

So, Mr. Chairman, the committee felt that it was the better part of wisdom not to appropriate for the unbudgeted items and continue to pile up unexpended funds available to the Secretary of Defense on some future occasion.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from North Carolina has expired.

Mr. CEDERBERG. Mr. Chairman, I yield the gentleman 5 additional minutes.

Mr. BATES. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JONAS. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. BATES. As the senior member of the House Committee on Armed Services on this side of the aisle, I want to commend the gentleman from North Carolina for the truly factual statement that he is making. I have traveled many parts of this world where we have sent our servicemen, and it is a shame to see the hovels in which many of them are living.

Last year the Secretary of Defense came before our committee and pledged if our committee would authorize these 8,500 new units—as a matter of fact, he wanted more, that they would be built, and now he, together with the President, have eliminated these items which we were told last year were more important than any other item contained in that construction bill.

So it seems to me to be in poor grace, Mr. Chairman, when I see messages coming here advocating more money be made available for FNMA and lower interest rates and all of these various things which are going to help the civilian economy—as important as they might be, they are not as important to me as the men in uniform who are fighting our battles throughout the world. So I want to thank the gentleman for bringing this matter to the attention of the House.

Mr. JONAS. Mr. Chairman, I appreciate the gentleman's comments, and I would like to simply add this, as I say, the 8,500 units were justified by the witnesses that appeared before us—and they justified even more units—and they insisted, and offered substantial and convincing testimony that our military people were living in substandard housing,

and that it was necessary to upgrade these living quarters in order to retain experienced and qualified men in the service.

In view of these facts it is beyond my comprehension, in view of all of those justifications and the strong case that was made, not only for the 8,500 housing units, but for troop housing and other supporting facilities, training facilities, that the Secretary of the Department of Defense would have the nerve to freeze or defer the construction of \$600 million of those items, and then come back this year and ask for funds to construct facilities in some of the same locations where facilities were deferred by him a year ago.

We tried very hard to get the witnesses before the subcommittee to tell us whether the new projects in the bill before us today have a higher priority than the projects that were deferred last year. We were not able to get any satisfactory answer to that. As a matter of fact, we could not get the witnesses to even say that a study had been completed; that any effect had been made to reconcile or compare the new projects sought with the projects previously applied for. It seems to me that it puts the Committee on Appropriations, and particularly the subcommittee, in a very bad light to come before this Committee of the Whole House 1 year and assure you that here are projects that are absolutely vital to the security of our country and to the well-being of our military personnel, and then come back the next year and have to confess to you that we either misunderstood what the request was, or that we were misled, and that consequently Congress appropriated \$600 million too much last year—or too much in the eyes of the Secretary of Defense.

I think we should not be put in that position. I think it is incumbent on the subcommittee and the Congress itself to take whatever steps are necessary to see to it that we are given correct information in the future, so that when projects are justified, as these have been justified before the committee, and then funded, that they should be constructed before we are asked to provide additional funds to construct alternate facilities at other locations, and in some instances at the very same locations.

I think this is a good bill. I wish we could resolve that the committee is not going to be satisfied with this sort of justification in the future, and that we could make it clear to the administration that Congress is not going to continue appropriating construction funds if the projects are not going to be constructed.

Mr. JONES of Alabama. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Alabama?

There was no objection.

Mr. JONES of Alabama. Mr. Chairman, I want to commend the Appropriations Committee for the well-balanced bill we have before us today appropriating funds for military construction during 1967. As we all know, the demands

on our military dollars at this time are particularly great.

However, I want to call particular attention to the committee's emphasis on sewage and waste disposal projects being requested by the military departments. I want to commend the committee for its recognition of this great need and for its action in appropriating the needed funds for sewage and waste disposal projects.

As chairman of the Natural Resources and Power Subcommittee of the Government Operations Committee I have, for the past 4 years, examined the particular need to step up abatement of water pollution from Federal installations. In three reports, we have attempted to pinpoint the major offenders and we have called for the Federal installations to set an example for the rest of the Nation in cleaning up our streams and lakes.

I am pleased to report that our latest survey shows an increased emphasis on the part of Federal installations to clean up our rivers and streams. This new emphasis is reflected in the Appropriation Committee's report on the bill we have before us today.

The committee has wisely provided funds in the amount of \$6,506,000 for sewage disposal projects during the current fiscal year. This includes \$2,824,000 for the Army at 5 locations; \$960,000 for the Navy at 5 locations; and \$2,722,000 for the Air Force at 15 locations. These funds will provide for primary and secondary waste treatment plants, collection mains, and industrial waste treatment facilities.

The committee notes that these facilities and similar facilities provided in previous years are only a start. As our Federal installations take a closer look at the problem and as the pollution abatement action becomes better defined at all levels of government, the need for funds to provide corrective action will increase considerably. For example, the Appropriations Committee notes that the initial estimate by the Air Force alone on long-range military construction expenditures to meet pollution abatement requirements are in the \$20 to \$40 million range.

I want to commend the committee for the recognition of the need for a vigorous program of pollution control and for its support of the program of necessary expenditures to meet this need.

It is particularly gratifying to see that the committee is attempting to provide funds for the most economical handling of the sewage and waste disposal problem. The report cites Army action at Fort Jackson, S.C., to combine efforts with the neighboring city of Columbia to provide new primary treatment facilities for both the city and the military installation. This combined effort will result in a saving of at least \$500,000 in excess of the Army cost if these needs were provided separately.

Our Nation's water pollution problems are severe. Our needs are great. Co-operative efforts are required by all elements of our society if we are to clean up our streams and provide the necessary water for our future needs.

Because the needs are so great, it behooves us to consolidate our efforts at

every possible opportunity to provide the needed facilities at the lowest possible cost.

The Appropriations Committee is to be commended for its timely recognition of the needs and its action to meet these needs.

Mr. SIKES. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may consume to the distinguished gentleman from Texas [Mr. CASEY].

Mr. BOW. Mr. Chairman, I make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair will count. [After counting.] Fifty-eight Members are present, not a quorum. The Clerk will call the roll.

The Clerk called the roll, and the following Members failed to answer to their names:

[Roll No. 283]

Abbutt	Friedel	Qule
Abernethy	Gallagher	Rees
Albert	Garmatz	Reinecke
Andrews,	Gilligan	Resnick
Glenn	Griffiths	Rogers, Tex.
Aspinall	Hagan, Ga.	Roncalio
Ayres	Hanna	Roybal
Boland	Hansen, Idaho	St Germain
Bolling	Hawkins	Senner
Broomfield	Hébert	Sickles
Celler	Helstoski	Sisk
Clancy	Hicks	Steed
Colmer	Hollifield	Stephens
Conable	Holland	Stratton
Corman	Horton	Teague, Tex.
Curtin	Irwin	Tenzer
Davis, Ga.	Jones, N.C.	Thompson, N.J.
Dent	Karh	Todd
Devine	King, N.Y.	Toll
Dickinson	Landrum	Trimble
Diggs	McMillan	Tuten
Dorn	Macdonald	Udall
Edmondson	Martin, Ala.	Van Deerlin
Evans, Colo.	Martin, Mass.	Walker, Miss.
Everett	Mills	Walker, N. Mex.
Evins, Tenn.	Morris	Weitner
Fallon	Morrison	White, Idaho
Farbstein	Murray	Whitten
Farnsley	O'Konski	Williams
Fisher	O'Neill, Mass.	Willis
Flynt	Pelly	Wilson
Fogarty	Powell	Charles H.

Accordingly, the Committee rose; and the Speaker having resumed the chair, Mr. ULLMAN, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union, reported that that Committee, having had under consideration the bill H.R. 17637, and finding itself without a quorum, he had directed the roll to be called, when 336 Members responded to their names, a quorum, and he submitted herewith the names of the absentees to be spread upon the Journal.

The Committee resumed its sitting.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Texas [Mr. CASEY].

Mr. CASEY. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman from Florida, and the distinguished chairman of the subcommittee for allowing me this time.

I wish to inquire, Mr. Chairman, concerning a proposal that has been under consideration for a couple of years. My inquiry is in reference to the conversion of the power plants at Elmendorf Base, and Fort Richardson, from coal to gas.

My recollection is that this has been under consideration for several years. The House Committee on Armed Services authorized this conversion last year, the Senate failed to include it, but this year they placed it in there, and it remained in the bill on final passage.

I would like to know, Mr. Chairman, in view of the fact that it would save, as I understand, about \$1 million a year, for the operation of these bases, if this committee has had this matter under consideration?

Mr. SIKES. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CASEY. I will be glad to yield to the gentleman.

Mr. SIKES. Mr. Chairman, may I say to the distinguished gentleman from Texas that this conversion has long appealed to me because it is estimated that the Government would save \$1 million a year.

This is one of the nonbudgeted items which were added to the authorization bill, but for which there is no budget request for funding.

There of course are two sides to the story. As I stated earlier, this conversion appeals to me because of the savings which are projected. These savings would be dependent upon the government continuing to get the gas at the price which has been offered for it now. This is considerably less than the price which is being paid by industry and by private homeowners. If there should be an increase in the price, then the savings could disappear. However, I would be willing to risk that.

Frankly, if I may say to the gentleman, my biggest problem at the moment is in the position of the Alaska delegation. The distinguished gentleman from Alaska [Mr. RIVERS] appeared before this committee last year in opposition to the proposal. It is hard to disregard the attitudes and beliefs of the people who represent an area.

They are disturbed about what this would do to their employment problem. They say that the Government is the biggest user of coal in Alaska, and if this market is lost to the coal mines, most of the miners would be unemployed. They also say that the Alaska Railroad depends in very large measure upon hauling this coal for its revenue. Then there is the fact that the Department of Interior was opposed to the conversion.

Nevertheless, I still think the conversion has a great deal of merit. There are sufficient funds in this bill to complete the planning for the conversion. This will also give the Department of Defense an opportunity to look further at the project. Planning will be completed, and if the Department is ready to support the item, a budgeted item will be prepared and we can go ahead with it next year.

Mr. CASEY. I sincerely thank the distinguished gentleman for the background and explanation he has given us. But is it not true that while negotiation and consideration of the use of gas is going on, the price of coal has gone up at least twice since the negotiations started?

Mr. SIKES. The price of coal has gone up. It is a fact of life that costs in Alaska are high. The best estimates are that we would save at least a million dollars a year, and I am not one who would disregard that.

Mr. CASEY. I appreciate the gentleman's statement. In my opinion, Alaska

should seek to develop this new natural resource they have discovered, because I think it would help their economy, and they are a little shortsighted in not trying to permit this new development.

I thank the distinguished chairman for his consideration of this item. I think it is a saving that we should take advantage of.

Mr. CEDERBERG. Mr. Chairman, I yield 10 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. BATES].

Mr. BATES. Mr. Chairman, I would like to make inquiry of the chairman of the subcommittee in respect to three items which were included in the authorization bill but which apparently have been eliminated from the bill before us.

Up in Boston there are three old landmarks. One is the Bunker Hill Monument; the second is the U.S.S. *Constitution*, Old Ironsides; another with almost equal vintage is the U.S. Naval Hospital. I understand that hospital item has been eliminated from the bill.

Mr. SIKES. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BATES. I have not finished, but I yield to the gentleman from Florida.

Mr. SIKES. I dislike to interrupt the gentleman, but before I respond to the question I think the gentleman is going to ask, I should like to say that among the other distinguished landmarks would be the distinguished gentleman from Massachusetts, our Speaker.

Mr. BATES. Mr. Chairman, there are two other items. One is the utility lines, at the Portsmouth Navy Shipyard, in the amount of \$295,000, as well as the item of \$2.8 million that was included in the authorization bill for the drydock. I note that all of these items have been eliminated. I wonder if the gentleman would comment in respect to them.

Mr. SIKES. I would like briefly to comment, and I want to commend the gentleman for his interest in these problems and for the very fine manner in which he serves his constituency. He is part of that great team on the Armed Services Committee, which has done such an outstanding job in improving the lot of those who wear the uniform.

Mr. BATES. I appreciate the gentleman's remarks. Now I would like to get some of the funds.

Mr. SIKES. If the gentleman is going to insist on specifics, and if he will yield—

Mr. BATES. I yield to the gentleman from Florida.

Mr. SIKES. Let me point out that three of the items which have been mentioned by the gentleman are in the area of nonbudgeted items which were added to the bill by the House Armed Services Committee. They are authorized, but there was no budget request for them. They are in the category of items for which this subcommittee has funded planning money and instructed the Department to complete planning so that they may be funded in an orderly manner as rapidly as the Department can utilize the funds and sees the need for them.

First of all, the gentleman mentioned the drydock No. 5, im-

provements at the naval shipyard at Boston. The design is only 30-percent complete on that. There is very little possibility of the contracting being done in 1967, projecting ourselves a full year ahead, so there will be ample opportunity for OSD to come to Congress for a budget item for funding next year, by the time that this planning can be completed.

On the naval hospital at Chelsea, which is a \$9,300,000 item, the planning is only 20-percent complete as of August 31, 1966. Extensive review is always required for the construction of hospitals. Planning is a more lengthy process. It is stated to the committee by the Department of the Navy that the construction contract could not be awarded until February 1968. Of course, that places it completely out of the purview of fiscal year 1967.

On the naval shipyard at Portsmouth, where an authorization is made for steam distribution improvements—and undoubtedly those are needed—this is one of the projects which has been projected for closing. I regret this is the case, because I had felt it was a project for which there was going to be a continuing need, but that is something neither the gentleman nor I can control.

If I may have the gentleman's attention, because I am dealing with specifics on this, may I point out that plans and specifications on this are zero complete. So there is no possibility any funding could be realized until some time in the next calendar year. If it is decided that this is an item which should be funded and placed in the budget, we would not lose any time, because plans are going forward under directions in this bill.

Mr. BATES. I thank the gentleman. The \$295,000 which we had scheduled in the authorization bill for Portsmouth would be amortized over the next 3 years.

In summation, then, what the chairman of the subcommittee advises, whether the money is put in this year or next year for these particular items would not make any difference because plans have not been advanced sufficiently far enough so that they could be commenced before 1968. Do I understand the gentleman correctly?

Mr. SIKES. That is correct.

Mr. GROVER. Mr. Chairman, a fortnight ago it was brought to my attention that the transient facilities for servicemen shipping overseas from McGuire Air Force Base in New Jersey were totally inadequate.

I was advised that many of our men were required to sleep in makeshift, improvised quarters, in a gymnasium, in hallways.

The members of this committee are to be applauded for their concern over the convenience, health, and comfort of our Armed Forces.

Regrettably, I find nothing in this bill which will solve this problem, although after my complaint to Secretary McNamara, I did receive assurance that this unfortunate condition which admittedly exists in other airports of embarkation will be improved.

Statements by Members on the floor today have indicated the urgent need for passage of this bill to improve living con-

ditions for our servicemen everywhere, living conditions which are presently below standard as a result of our rapid military buildup, and accordingly, I wholeheartedly support this bill.

Mr. PICKLE. Mr. Chairman, included in this bill are funds in the amount of \$12,138,000 for construction facilities at 11 bases of the Tactical Air Command, including \$4,487,000 for a variety of facilities at Bergstrom Air Force Base in Austin, Tex.

Bergstrom, over the past year, has assumed the responsibility of headquarters operation of the 12th Air Force.

It was formerly a Strategic Air Command base and I realize it was an economy move that has brought about the closing of the base as a SAC facility. Nevertheless, I feel that the move has strengthened the air command, and I am particularly pleased that the former headquarters at James Connally in Waco, Tex., have been put to such fine use by Texas A. & M. University as a training school.

Bergstrom is ready to assume the full functions and responsibilities as headquarters of the 12th Air Force of the Tactical Air Command, and the funds appropriated in this bill will insure the orderly transfer of this command. Bergstrom AFB is an excellent facility which has proved itself well in both war and peace. The people of Austin and central Texas are proud of the service it has rendered our Nation and we are delighted to see this new TAC Headquarters Administration Building established there. Our fullest cooperation is extended to the Air Force in this extension.

Mr. LOVE. Mr. Chairman, I support this appropriation bill even though I have some reservations. The Military Construction Subcommittee failed to fund all the line items authorized by the Armed Services Committee mainly because the Department of Defense had failed to request certain items as not being essential to the war in Vietnam. Also, it was argued that in some instances, the authorization of the Armed Services Committee was not included in the President's budget hence would have an adverse effect on the economy. In fact, the chairman of the Military Construction Appropriations Committee indicated that the President would not spend nonbudgeted items, even if funded.

Before I vote for the bill as being in the national interest, I make the following observations:

First. It is always my hope that our failure to fund items now because of the war in Vietnam will not affect our security in the future. May I say that the Armed Services Committee is constantly cognizant of this and I am not always certain that the Appropriations Committee is more affected by matters of economy.

Second. I can certainly understand that it is just as important not to spend money for nonessential military items as it is for other nonessential items and those who argue we should spend the money irrespective of economic effects simply because it is military are also

wrong. I must assume that the Appropriations Committee give this careful consideration.

Third. The gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. RIVERS], chairman of the Armed Services Committee, brought out in a colloquy with the gentleman from Florida [Mr. SIKES] that the Appropriations Committee will fund the authorized items including those authorized for Wright-Patterson Air Force Base at the earliest possible time commensurate with the war in Vietnam.

As to the district I represent, the failure to recommend funding of an engineering test laboratory at Wright-Patterson Air Force Base is a serious mistake. The laboratory is required to relocate the Air Force Packaging Evaluation Agency to Wright-Patterson as a part of the Air Force realignment of depot functions. There is an urgent need for this lab. The developing package technique is exceedingly important for the present war in Vietnam. The primary responsibility for packaging vested within the Air Force has been placed in the office of the Director of Transportation at AFLC. The command headquarters for AFLC is at Wright-Patterson Air Force Base. The AMA who had the responsibility previously is being phased out. The move to Wright-Patterson permits full utilization of the four major labs located there and supports the earlier economy decision. The packaging of instruments, optics and other fragile hardware for transportation long distances is of vital importance. The packaging agency is closely related to the overall logistics mission of the Air Force.

While the justification for a bachelor officer quarters is impressive—the need at Wright-Patterson being for 1,130 spaces, the authorization will temporarily protect the program and the promise of the chairman of an early appropriation is convincing enough to postpone funding because of the overall economic situation. I rather expected this move and, while I believe the justification is more than convincing, the authorization of an additional \$727,000 is sufficient at this time since it is considered as a nonessential item.

Mr. Chairman, it is always difficult in these matters not to be parochial but, while I am not overjoyed by the decision of the committee, I nevertheless trust their dedication and integrity. It is therefore my belief that this bill should be supported as being in the national interest irrespective of parochial considerations.

Thank you.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Mr. Chairman, today I rise in support of H.R. 17637, the appropriations for military construction for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1967.

As a member of the House Armed Services Committee, I have an opportunity to study the needs of our Nation's defense efforts and in the interest of national defense I earnestly support H.R. 17637. By approving this appropriation measure we are, once again, saying no to the spread of godless communism. We are approving funds to assist our servicemen and

women to help prevent the spread of this malignant growth.

In my district, the Eighth Congressional District of Louisiana, we have Fort Polk at Leesville and England Air Force Base at Alexandria. We know the importance of national defense in our district because we are constantly reminded by the presence of these two installations.

Thank you for the opportunity to briefly express my support of H.R. 17637 and I can assure you of my continued support of our national defense.

Mr. CEDERBERG. Mr. Chairman, I have no further requests for time.

Mr. SIKES. Mr. Chairman, I have no further requests for time on this side.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will read. The Clerk read as follows:

MILITARY CONSTRUCTION, NAVY

For acquisition, construction, installation, and equipment of temporary or permanent public works, naval installations, and facilities for the Navy as currently authorized in military public works or military construction Acts, in Public Law 88-637, and in sections 2673 and 2675 of title 10, United States Code, including personnel in the Bureau of Yards and Docks and other personal services necessary for the purposes of this appropriation, \$126,227,000, to remain available until expended.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. LONG OF MARYLAND

Mr. LONG of Maryland. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. Long of Maryland: On Page 2, line 18, after "appropriation," strike out "\$126,227,000" and insert "\$111,327,000".

Mr. LONG of Maryland. Mr. Chairman, my amendment would reduce by \$14,900,000 the amount appropriated for the Navy's military construction program, the sum approved for fiscal year 1967 costs on construction of a third naval recruit training camp. I am offering this amendment for reasons that I went into in debate, reasons which I think are compelling. In the first place, I do not believe the Navy wants this third boot camp to be located where it says it does, at Orlando, Fla. Although the bill does not specify the location and leaves this to be determined, the word is that the Navy will put it at Orlando; and I believe that the Navy will not do so willingly.

I have given a long list of statements by the Navy, indicating that Orlando is incapable of accommodating the activities currently carried on at Bainbridge, that out of 10 sites, including Orlando, which were studied, none was as acceptable as Bainbridge. There were statements such as, that by Admiral Hull:

Bainbridge is very definitely hard core. It is in the right place. We want to bring it up to date so that it will compare favorably with both Great Lakes and San Diego. All three are needed.

After a year of this type of statement, the Navy suddenly reversed itself and said that it wanted a recruit camp at Orlando, and proposed to move 4,000 of 5,000 people from Bainbridge to Orlando.

This involves some very great costs. We have already, taking the Navy at

its word, authorized and appropriated money in the amount of \$3½ million, for Wherry housing and WAVE training facilities at Bainbridge, which are not even completed at this moment. This is a great waste, we ought to do all we can to eliminate it.

The Navy has given some cost factors and some weather factors which do not stand up, on the basis of the Navy's own statement that climate should not be a factor for serious consideration in any decision which would rule out Bainbridge, indicating that there had never been any epidemic there in 22 years of practical experience at Bainbridge, and indicating a negligible rate of respiratory diseases.

I further point out that appropriating \$14.9 million—which will lead ultimately to nearly \$100 million—will only add to the large sum of appropriated funds which the Department of Defense has seen fit to defer. So far \$600 million worth of projects funded for fiscal year 1966 or earlier have been deferred. I do not believe we should add another \$14.9 million to that.

I wish to point out further that a third recruit training project is a long-range project and is not specifically intended for the Vietnam crisis, since the first recruits would not go in until 1968 and the last not until 1970. The captain at Bainbridge informed me that the entire transfer would not be effective until 1974.

I do not believe we should tackle a long-range program in the middle of the Vietnam crisis, since such a project would divert both men and material from the war effort and increase the mounting inflationary pressures on our national economy.

The President has urged that all unnecessary appropriations should be cut back; this is an unnecessary appropriation.

Finally, I do not believe that Congress should relinquish legislative oversight over the Navy decisions. We should not fund \$14.9 million for a project for the Navy in a location unspecified and then let the Navy come back later to tell us where they intend to put it. This type of thing leads to very loose policy on the part of our Government.

The very fact that we have been voting money on a deferred basis has resulted in a situation in which at the very moment the Navy was proposing to move this project out of Bainbridge it went ahead and broke ground for a \$1¼ million WAVE barrack and \$2 million worth of Wherry housing.

This type of thing could not happen if the Congress insisted on maintaining a tight rein on its expenditures.

So I ask the Members to support this amendment to drop from this year's appropriation \$14.9 million until we have had a chance to go into it further; until the Navy and the Defense Department have had a chance to take another look at this whole question of a third recruit training camp. I believe if they are given this chance they will, in the end, change their minds again, because they have changed their minds before.

Mr. SIKES. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

(By unanimous consent, Mr. SIKES was allowed to proceed for 5 additional minutes.)

Mr. SIKES. Mr. Chairman, first I should like to yield to the distinguished gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. PATTEN], who is an able member of the subcommittee. He has performed in an outstanding manner and given excellent service throughout the difficult and long period of hearings and consideration on the bill. I am very appreciative of his fine work and I yield to him at this time.

Mr. PATTEN. Thank you, Mr. Chairman, for yielding me this time.

I do not think it is our business to be telling the Defense Department where to locate facilities. I sat in on all of the hearings about Bainbridge, which took many hours. Geographically, since our area up in New Jersey and New York contributes more men than other sections of the country proportionately to boot training, I was very interested in these hearings. Bainbridge is only a 2-hour automobile drive from New York City for my family. But despite that I am convinced all of the evidence shows the Navy must have a boot training station on the east coast, and I believe it will be a great mistake to eliminate this money at this time.

Mr. SIKES. Mr. Chairman, I want to take a moment to express my appreciation, also, for the very fine work done by the distinguished gentleman from Maryland [Mr. LONG] as a member of this subcommittee. He has been faithful in his attendance, has been a hard working member and contributed significantly. I recognize and appreciate this contribution and I admire and commend him for the zeal that he shows for his own State. Regretfully I must accept the fact—and I do not think there will be any question of this—that my good friend wants this item stricken from the bill simply because it is not in the State of Maryland. Now, we cannot have everything we want. As my friend, Mr. PATTEN, just pointed out, it is not the business of the Congress to try to tell the Department of Defense where military bases must go. It would quickly produce an intolerable situation.

Mr. Chairman, I think I might take just a moment and point out that Maryland is doing very well in this bill. There is \$17,148,000 of new construction in the bill for Maryland. It is second only to the State of California in the amount of money that is carried for new military construction.

Now, Mr. Chairman, the facts are that in this budget and in the presentation by the Navy the request was made for \$14.9 million for the initial increment of construction for a third recruit training center at Orlando. The authorizing legislation approved the funds requested but did not spell out the location. They recommended in the authorization that a site be selected by the Department of the Navy and the Department of the Navy has indicated that Orlando is its choice. This subcommittee approves the funds requested, but rather than leave it up to the Navy to pick the site of the recruit training center without any restrictions on the part of Congress, it requires in this

bill that notification of the site so selected be made to the Congress before any award is made on contracts. We do not feel that Congress should surrender all of its prerogatives.

Now let us look at the facts. This request for a third Naval Recruit Training Center is made only because it is badly needed. The conditions in the two existing Naval Recruit Training Centers at Great Lakes and at San Diego are badly overcrowded and have been for a long time. The South Vietnamese buildup has accentuated that overcrowding.

Now, Mr. Chairman, the regulations require 72 square feet but, actually by reason of overcrowding there are only 35 to 40 square feet per man. That is about 6 feet square. That is not much larger than a grave. That is where you are asking these boys to live when they are first sent to a military camp. They are stacked like cordwood while they learn discipline, learn military custom, while they train, and while they learn to perform the responsibilities that go with military service. It is not a happy or a wholesome situation.

Mr. Chairman, this overcrowding has produced some serious medical problems, especially in the nature of respiratory diseases and meningitis. Twelve recruits—get this—12 recruits have died in the recent past at these bases and it is considered that overcrowding contributed to the causes of these deaths.

In 1963 it was necessary to stop the input of recruits to San Diego for a period of 5 weeks following an outbreak of meningitis. If another outbreak should occur, then we would have to close down a recruit training center. Where would you put the men? The training program simply would have to stop. It could have a serious effect upon the recruit training program.

Mr. Chairman, I do not want it on my conscience and I do not think the Members want it on their consciences if boys die from conditions resulting from our failure to provide them a proper place in which to train.

Now, Mr. Chairman, originally the Department of the Navy had scheduled the center to be located at Bainbridge, as the distinguished gentleman from Maryland [Mr. LONG] pointed out. A similar activity was conducted there in World War II. But since that decision, the Department of the Air Force decided to vacate its base at Orlando. When the first surveys were made, the Department of the Air Force had planned to retain a part of the Orlando base but subsequent to the Navy's decision to go to Bainbridge with this base, the Department of the Air Force announced that it was vacating the entire Orlando base. This contributed to the Navy's decision on Orlando.

Mr. Chairman, Orlando is a very good base. It is an air base. And, the Air Force has, historically, built first-class installations, and I am glad they have done so. This base is located in the State of Florida. It is not located in my district. As a matter of fact it is located in a Republican district, and that bothers me some.

Now, Mr. Chairman, the decision of the Department of the Navy to go to Orlando

is based upon several factors. One of these factors is the suitability of climate. The recruit has to spend about 60 percent of his time outdoors and, certainly, Orlando presents a very fine outdoor climate.

At Orlando there are better community and on-base personnel support facilities. This is very important.

Mr. Chairman, at Bainbridge we would have to construct nearly everything in the way of community and on-base facilities from scratch and that would cost millions of dollars. These facilities are available at Orlando, either on the base or in the community. We will save millions of dollars there, and these amounts are not carried in the cost of base construction. There are other environmental conditions which are advantageous to recruit training and support facilities at Orlando and which are said by the Department of the Navy to be available there but which are not available at Bainbridge. The ability to make maximum use of existing assets which have been superbly developed by the Department of the Air Force are to be considered in the situation at Orlando.

Now, Mr. Chairman, then let us get into cost. That is a very important matter. It is No. 1. All right, cost consideration, according to qualified Navy cost estimates show at Orlando a total cost of \$81 million as compared to the cost of \$86 million at Bainbridge.

Mr. Chairman, we have to assume that the Department of the Navy knows what it is talking about. Their construction people are among the best in the world. They cannot afford to furnish haphazard figures on costs. They will be held responsible for them. The Navy says it will cost \$5 million more to build an adequate facility at Bainbridge than it would cost at Orlando.

In addition to that, housing is available. We have discussed housing all afternoon—housing for the families of service personnel and the personnel who will provide support and training services for this base.

There is a deficit in family housing at Bainbridge of 750 units. We cannot get the Department of Defense to build the 8,500 units we authorized and funded last year. How are you going to get these additional 750 units? Well, they are already available at Orlando. We will not have to build houses. We have certification from the Federal Housing Administration to the Chief of Naval Personnel and to the committee that there is more than enough housing available.

Now, there are some good facilities at Bainbridge, and the Department has indicated to us that it has every desire to continue to use the facilities that are good and usable.

We have a list here of activities comprising 840 people who would be continued at Bainbridge in any event.

I am reliably informed by the Department of the Navy and the Department of Defense that Bainbridge also is being looked at in connection with other possible uses as they may develop.

There is no disposition just to abandon Bainbridge because this naval re-

cruit training can be done better in Orlando.

Let me make this final statement. All of the studies have shown clearly and unmistakably that it will be cheaper, better, more efficient, more in the interest of the recruits themselves, more in the interest of the taxpayers, to construct this facility at Orlando.

The Navy has completed its master planning. That is not true of Bainbridge. We would lose a year while the Navy completed master planning at Bainbridge. At Orlando they are ready to proceed with construction in an orderly way.

There is every reason that this committee should approve the funds which are needed at this time to stop overcrowding, and to provide needed training facilities, and to reduce the danger of disease and death in the present recruit training facilities.

Mr. MORTON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SIKES. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. MORTON. I would like to ask the distinguished chairman this question: If that is true, if every single one of the studies indicated the advocacy of moving these facilities out of the Bainbridge plant, why did they build a \$1.25 million new WAVES barracks at Bainbridge which will never be occupied?

Mr. SIKES. I just stated that the activities which will be retained at Bainbridge will include 840 personnel. The present barracks will not accommodate personnel in that number.

The services do hope to use the facilities that are there which are good, first-class facilities. That includes the housing that is available. It will be used either for the activities of Bainbridge itself, or for nearby installations, such as Edgewood Arsenal, which is only 8 miles away. These would require all of the housing available. I would certainly support efforts to see that whatever facilities are available at Bainbridge would be utilized to the fullest possible extent.

Mr. LONG of Maryland. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SIKES. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. LONG of Maryland. The gentleman indicated when he was asked at other times that there would be other facilities that would be moved to Bainbridge, but I have never been able to get him to say exactly what these are.

Mr. SIKES. Because it is not within my power to make these decisions.

Mr. LONG of Maryland. What does the Navy plan to put at Bainbridge to take the place of these facilities that are being moved away to Orlando?

Mr. SIKES. I have not responded to that because it is not my decision to say what will be placed at Bainbridge. But I can tell you this: I have a statement from the Department of Defense, as of this morning, that 840 personnel will continue to be located there, plus a small coordinating staff; that study options are in progress relative to the continued use of Bainbridge for other activities including the feasibility of locating the Defense Language Institute there, if it is not allowed to go to Texas. It is also

stated that Bainbridge will be considered as a possible location for a number of defense activities currently housed in the Washington area. This will be a part of current studies to reduce overcrowding in the Washington area. The activities which will be considered, and which cannot be named at this point for obvious reasons, range anywhere from 500 to 4,000 personnel each.

These and other options cannot be identified until after the basic budget decisions are made.

I can state that under the prodding of this committee the Department is seeking to utilize all of the facilities that are available and usable, wherever available.

Mr. MATHIAS. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the last word.

Mr. LONG of Maryland. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MATHIAS. I am glad to yield to my colleague from Maryland.

Mr. LONG of Maryland. I have heard a great deal about meningitis. I do not believe that so many millions of dollars should be projected on the basis of so few cases of the disease since this project started in San Diego.

I talked with Public Health people about meningitis. They informed me that the causes of meningitis are extremely obscure and it is difficult to pin them down. We had an outbreak at the Great Lakes and we did not move the projects to Bainbridge. Right now we can reactivate this Navy Training Center. Let us build it now and get going, instead of building a \$100 million base 1,000 miles away which will take 2 to 5 years to activate.

Second, I want to point out that the decision on Orlando was made and known about at the time that they made the decision not to go to Bainbridge, because Bainbridge was not a satisfactory place. They knew Bainbridge was going to be closed. We have documentary evidence. I read it here during the debate.

I want to point out also that, so far as the cost figures are concerned, we have \$30 million worth of cost involved here and \$17 million of it the Navy really did not refute in our hearings on the military construction program. They offered a weak defense on the \$30 million discrepancy which we pointed out.

Mr. SIKES. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MATHIAS. I yield to the gentleman from Florida.

Mr. SIKES. Does not the gentleman realize the effect of the amendment, that any work on this project would be delayed a year? Instead of bringing the project to Bainbridge, you would be postponing it a year, after which it would take another year for plans and specifications, which are already available for the Orlando project. I am sure the gentleman does not want to deny the boys in the present recruit training centers the opportunity to live somewhere other than in 6 by 6 spaces. He would not want to deny them the right to have these proposed quarters.

Mr. LONG of Maryland. I do not believe that this is needed for the meningitis problem. I do not think it is needed

for the Vietnam war. I think this is a long-range project, and I think the Navy has indicated its lack of decisiveness, its lack of real desire to go to Orlando. I think we need a year to decide where to put it. That is not a long time to decide where to spend \$100 million which could be spent for the wrong establishment in the wrong place. We are spending a great many millions—hundreds of millions of dollars—in Vietnam and on other projects. Let us take a little longer before we make this expenditure.

Mr. MATHIAS. I want to thank the gentleman for his contribution. As I said earlier in responding to the gentleman from the First District of Maryland [Mr. MORTON], that he and the gentleman from Maryland [Mr. LONG], have done a signal service in bringing these points to the attention of the House, because they involve issues that are of importance to every Member of the House.

Mr. MATHIAS. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks at this point in the Record and at the point when he spoke previously.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Maryland?

There was no objection.

Mr. GURNEY. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

As the distinguished chairman of the subcommittee, the gentleman from Florida [Mr. SIKES], has said, the real issue before the House is whether or not the Navy is going to be permitted to build a third boot training camp, which they have said they needed desperately, for if the amendment of the gentleman from Maryland succeeds, the issue will be dead, at least for this year. But I think we also ought to recognize that there is another issue, and I call it the concealed issue, except I really do not think it has been concealed now, and that is a last-minute, desperate attempt to save this boot training camp for a particular area of this country, namely Maryland.

That is the issue we have before us. The history has been ably stated by the chairman of the subcommittee, but I think it is worth going over because it really brings the issue before us. It so happened there was a third training camp in Bainbridge, Md., in World War II. It also is true the Navy 2 or 3 years ago, when it considered opening another training camp, did make noises that they would consider Maryland. It is also true the Maryland delegation felt it was going there, and now they are embarrassed. That is really the main issue before us.

I might say, ladies and gentlemen, I had nothing to do with the location of the base at Orlando, Fla. I remember in the debate the gentleman from Maryland said "someone up there" had something to do with the decision. I do not know who that "someone up there" would be, but I cannot imagine him being on the side of the particular congressional district in Florida involved. I cannot believe there are politics involved, but the Navy is trying to come up with a

location they think is best for the location of the boot camp.

But after they had tentatively decided, but never made a top level decision, on Bainbridge, Md., the base closures came along in 1964, which incidentally affected a lot of Members in this House. Many of us lost a lot of installations we did not want to lose, but I do not remember a lot of flurry on the floor of this House to try to save a particular project for a particular congressional area. In any event bases did open up. The base at Orlando became available, and the Navy looked at it, and decided upon it, for the location of the new boot camp.

The merits are on our side. As the chairman pointed out, costs are less in Orlando to construct this boot camp in Florida than in Maryland. There is more family housing in our area. A survey has been made meticulously on this. Community support facilities have been found to be superior in Florida over Maryland. Our transportation facilities are excellent. Our climate is good, too. Florida is an excellent place to live and to train men.

This economy issue is as phony as a three-dollar bill. I believe those of us who are interested in economy ought to know that. The point here is not to take out money because this project is not needed. The point is to take the money out so that the project can be killed for a year and then reexamined and possibly gotten back to Maryland. That is the economy issue. For heaven's sake, do not fall for that, because the economy issue as shown by studies, and this thing has been studied from one end to the other, is the study the Appropriations Committee itself made on this, which shows that the merits are in favor of Orlando. It is more economical to build this base in Orlando.

Believe me, there is not any issue in this bill—and I am sure that the committee people who have processed this bill will bear me out on this—that has been more thoroughly studied and discussed and rediscussed—and cussed, as far as the Maryland people are concerned—than this one item. It was in the Senate authorization subcommittee first, and it went to the full committee. It went back to the subcommittee, and went back to the full committee. It has been before our House authorization committees, the subcommittee and the full committee. It has been in the subcommittee of the Appropriations Committee, and also before the full committee. Believe me, the committees involved have thrashed this issue out from one end to the other, as to whether it ought to go to Florida or be retained in Maryland.

The key thing in this whole argument is the one the distinguished Representative from New Jersey [Mr. PATTEN], hit upon. That is the factor here of whether we are going to settle on the House floor every time we have a dispute on where a military installation is to be located, and whether it is going to be in one congressional district or another. Are we going to settle on the House floor that it ought to be here because one particular Representative, or two or three Rep-

resentatives think their area ought to have it?

I do not believe the House should do this. I believe it has to be done in the committee, where proper deliberation can be had and the merits decide the issue rather than whose district is or is not benefited.

I believe, rather than an issue between Florida and Maryland, the issue is that the House ought to uphold the committee's decision. I urge the defeat of this amendment.

Mr. CRALEY. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the requisite number of words.

Mr. Chairman, I should like to affirm and concur with the amendment offered by my colleague, the gentleman from Maryland [Mr. LONG], to H.R. 17637, the military construction bill.

The purpose of the amendment is to delay the appropriation of some \$14,900,000 to insure careful and thorough consideration of the future of the Bainbridge Training Center at Bainbridge, Md. No method for determining a new location is set forth either in the authorizing legislation or in the reports accompanying the House or Senate bills.

The Bainbridge Training Center, although not in my district, is of special interest to my 19th District, Pennsylvania. Three hundred to four hundred Pennsylvanians from York County are employed at the training center in Maryland. Removal of the Center would occasion economic and personal displacement for these people, as well as entail unnecessary expense on the part of the Government.

Mr. MORTON. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the requisite number of words.

I merely wish to say that I do not believe the issue is the question of whether Orlando has more golf courses and swimming pools than there are in Cecil County, Md. I am sure Orlando has. The people there are very affluent people.

The issue is this: we established a Defense Department a few years ago, which was service-wide in nature in its responsibility. This is an example of very poor management by the Defense Department.

Money was spent on a study which was started in 1964, which now has gone for nothing because an Air Force base became available. If this Air Force base was that close to availability, the Defense Department should have known it. They are full of computers over there, and systems analysis.

Mr. LONG of Maryland. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MORTON. I yield to my colleague from Maryland.

Mr. LONG of Maryland. The Defense Department did know about it and admitted it knew about it. I read from page 834 of our hearings.

Mr. MORTON. The fact is, I do not believe we are getting the kind of management from the Defense Department we should have. Issues like this should not be debated here. This should have been solved, if we are to have proper interservice management of the Defense Department.

I believe that the upholding of this amendment and the passage of this

amendment to the bill will be in good order. It will sharpen up the management of the Defense Department as it should be sharpened up.

I rise in support of the amendment of the gentleman from Maryland.

Mr. CEDERBERG. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

It is with great reluctance that I take the floor this afternoon, because I recognize the problem we are faced with here today.

I believe it has been pointed out that this is a matter which has been under study by the Armed Services Committee of the House and the Armed Services Committee of the Senate. The decision was made by those bodies that this third training center should be authorized. Neither of those committees decided on a location.

We in the Appropriations Subcommittee on Military Construction, after hearing this matter, decided that we ought to provide the funds to make this facility available to the Navy.

It has been pointed out by many that we have two recruit training centers, one in San Diego and one at Great Lakes in Illinois. There was a time when we did have a closing of San Diego, and all recruits had to go to one place.

We had an unfortunate situation in the Army at Fort Ord some time ago, with meningitis and other respiratory problems which caused that base to be closed for a long time.

This is a problem which we who are here are going to make a decision on in just a few minutes, as to whether the Navy ought to have a third recruit training center.

If the Navy and the Armed Services Committees had decided it ought to go to Bainbridge or to Orlando or to anywhere else, that would not make any difference, so far as I am concerned personally.

As one member of the committee, after having listened to the testimony—and we can even have a difference of opinion as to whether a third recruit training center is needed—I am not going to vote at this time to reduce the funds which will, essentially, remove the opportunity to have this recruit training center. I believe we have put sufficient language in our report. It says, "You will come back and let us know what you are going to do before you spend the money."

This is about as far as I can see that we on our committee can go.

As I say, it is with great reluctance that I oppose this amendment, but I do not see any other way to do.

I might say that the gentlemen from Maryland [Mr. LONG and Mr. MORTON], have been very diligent in their debate and in their interest in this matter. I commend them for it. I hope they will understand my position in this does not in any way reflect my feelings for these two wonderful men.

Mr. LONG of Maryland. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CEDERBERG. I yield to the gentleman from Maryland.

Mr. LONG of Maryland. Does not the gentleman recognize the inconsistency of his position now with that which he put forth a little while ago? A little

while ago he was complaining about deferment of tremendous numbers of projects. Basically he was complaining, was he not, about the lack of close legislative oversight over expenditure of funds?

This is an example of what happens when we do not have close legislative oversight. We are authorizing something which may not be built soon, which may not be put in place for many years to come. We are appropriating money for an unspecified location.

Will we ever get the Defense Department to spend money in the year we appropriate it in unless we start cutting down on them and not giving them the money?

Mr. CEDERBERG. In reply to the gentleman, let me say I do not think there is any inconsistency at all in my position. We are talking about two entirely different matters. This is a question of a recruit training center. Deferred projects have generally been in the area of troop housing and existing installations that we think should have gone forward.

I feel they should go forward just as I feel this one should. So I do not see any inconsistency at all here. I do not feel that this should be deferred and I do not think the other should be deferred. I think I am completely consistent in my position.

Mr. HARDY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield to me?

Mr. CEDERBERG. I yield to the gentleman from Virginia.

Mr. HARDY. I would like to commend the gentleman for the position he is taking. As a member of the Committee on Armed Services, I would like to say we did consider this matter in our committee and we felt that there was a need for a third recruit training center.

There was no final decision made as to where it should be located. It seemed to us to be the better course of action to provide the authority for it. I am glad that the Committee on Appropriations saw fit to provide funds for it so that as soon as a final decision is reached on the location they can proceed with the construction of it.

Mr. Chairman, I think the gentleman's position is eminently sound and I hope the amendment will be defeated.

Mr. BENNETT. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the Record.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Florida?

There was no objection.

Mr. BENNETT. Mr. Chairman, the provision of this bill relative to the third Navy training facility should be allowed to stand. The facility is greatly needed. The only real contest is an effort to move the location from Orlando to Maryland; but the amendment offered by the gentleman from Maryland would kill the whole project for at least a year. Further, it would cost less at Orlando, and would offer a better year around training capability there.

Much has been said about the Navy changing its mind on it. As I read the record, the Secretary of the Navy, who

speaks for the Navy, has never approved any site but the Orlando site. The citation of other opinions in the Navy were apparently never the final departmental decision at any time.

Mr. SIKES. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that all debate on this amendment and all amendments thereto now cease.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Florida?

There was no objection.

The CHAIRMAN. The question occurs on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Maryland.

The amendment was rejected.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

MILITARY CONSTRUCTION, AIR FORCE

For acquisition, construction, installation, and equipment of temporary or permanent public works, military installations, and facilities for the Air Force as currently authorized in military public works or military construction Acts, in sections 2673 and 2675 of title 10, United States Code, \$209,564,000, to remain available until expended.

Mr. CLARENCE J. BROWN, JR. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I would like to express my concern on a couple of items which have been deleted from this appropriation bill with reference to Wright-Patterson Air Force Base in Ohio. While I recognize the need for economy at this time in the pursuit of the war in Vietnam, in the interests of winning that war as quickly as possible—and in this area I must bow to the specialized knowledge of the gentleman on both the Committee on Appropriations and the Committee on Armed Services—still I am concerned that perhaps we may be deferring some needs or some projects now which might have a deleterious effect on our ability to win the next war. I refer specifically to the elimination of a bachelor officers quarters construction at Wright-Patterson Air Force Base for \$727,000 and a laboratory for the study of packaging equipment for the Air Force in the amount of \$525,000.

Mr. Chairman, I am concerned not so much about the bachelor officers quarters, because I think it is understandable that we may expect people on stateside duty to suffer a little discomfort in the interest of shortening the discomfort which is being experienced by the men serving in Vietnam; but I would like to ask the gentleman from Florida, if I may, the circumstances surrounding the deferring of the Air Force Packaging and Evaluation Agency at Wright-Patterson Air Force Base.

Mr. SIKES. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CLARENCE J. BROWN, JR. I will be happy to yield.

Mr. SIKES. Mr. Chairman, I would be very happy to comment upon the item to which the gentleman from Ohio has referred.

The engineering test facility, which is a packaging and research program, is in the process of being transferred from Brookley Air Force Base in Alabama to Wright-Patterson Air Force Base.

Mr. Chairman, the committee found in its investigations that instead of conducting a study as to the ability to utilize existing facilities at other bases within the Department of the Air Force, the Department of the Army, and the Department of the Navy, the study was limited only to existing facilities at Air Force Logistics Command depots.

Mr. Chairman, it seemed to us that before we build another facility, whatever the cost may be—and the cost of this was estimated to be \$525,000—we should try to utilize the other military facilities and buildings which have been used or are adaptable for this purpose.

I can understand the gentleman's concern, because the gentleman is interested in Wright-Patterson Air Force Base. That is a very fine base but we feel a responsibility to try to be sure that there is not something fed into this program when existing facilities can be used just as well and thereby save the taxpayers of America up to \$525,000.

Mr. Chairman, the bachelor officers' quarters is one of the nonbudgeted items which was added to the bill by the Committee on Armed Services.

The design on this facility is less than 10 percent complete.

One thing that stuck in the minds of the members of the committee is that there has been a relatively small increase in total officer strength at Wright-Patterson Air Force Base, and 100 bachelor officers quarters spaces were deferred by the Secretary a year ago.

Obviously, Mr. Chairman, the Secretary is not going to pick up and build this item which was not budgeted and when he deferred a similar one a year ago.

Mr. Chairman, I am in sympathy with the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. CLARENCE J. BROWN, JR.] concerning the bachelor officers quarters. But I believe the committee took the only course open to it. It has, however, recommended that planning for the bachelor officers quarters proceed.

Mr. CLARENCE J. BROWN, JR. Mr. Chairman, I appreciate the gentleman's comments and I feel sure the need for the bachelor officers quarters will continue to exist and it will be necessary that this project be given consideration in the future.

Mr. Chairman, my concern is whether or not the deferment of the appropriation of \$525,000 for the packaging facility is, in fact, as the gentleman stated, or whether or not it may be in order to give someone who has a more parochial interest an opportunity to make his pitch next year to get this facility located elsewhere.

The need for prompt construction of the AFPEA is clearly set out on pages 161, 162, and 163 of part 1 of hearings before the subcommittee of the Committee on Appropriations on military construction appropriations for 1967. The Air Force makes clear that the concern about duplication with the packaging research being done by other branches of the military services is not well-founded. It also makes an excellent case for the need for construction of a new facility rather than the expensive remodeling of

an inadequate facility which might then still be inadequate.

But I should like to call particular attention to the reasons spelled out by the Air Force for locating the facility at Wright-Patterson Air Force Base in section 7(d), on page 163, as follows:

(d) Wright-Patterson Air Force Base was selected as the site for construction of the new facility for the following reasons:

(1) It would place the activity close to Headquarters AFPLC, which is responsible for its management and operational control.

(2) It would provide for timely conferences and joint analysis on important and critical subjects.

(3) The Aeronautical Systems Division, which is one of the largest users of the services of AFPEA, is located at Wright-Patterson AFB.

(4) The proximity of Wright-Patterson AFB to other Government agencies, industry and educational institutions which will provide an excellent source for recruitment of qualified personnel.

I am concerned that this delay in AFPEA location at Wright-Patterson Air Force Base may unnecessarily delay progress in packaging methods of value to not only the Air Force and other military services, but to our space program and domestic air transport and other modes of transportation. I trust no parochial interests are responsible for such delay.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

Sec. 111. None of the funds appropriated in this Act shall be used to (1) acquire land, (2) provide for site preparation, or (3) install utilities for any family housing, except housing for which funds have been made available in annual military construction appropriation acts.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. CEDERBERG

Mr. CEDERBERG. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. CEDERBERG: On page 8, beginning on line 8, insert a new paragraph to read:

"Sec. 112. Appropriations made by this Act shall be reduced in an amount of not less than \$300,000,000 through the apportionment process as prescribed by law (31 U.S.C. 665)." And change section 112 to section 113.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Michigan [Mr. CEDERBERG] is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. CEDERBERG. Mr. Chairman, this is the amendment I referred to when we were in general debate.

The purpose of this amendment, and I want to make it crystal clear, is not to touch in any way any project in this bill. It is designed to require the Defense Department to use at least \$300 million of the frozen funds for deferred projects in the 1966 bill.

Referring again to our report, you will see on page 2, that Defense will have for obligation after this legislation passes for fiscal 1967, \$2,215,341,419. For the Reserve components they will have \$81,104,011.

Now available for expenditure in fiscal 1967 after this appropriation is passed will be \$3,076,271,330, Army, Navy, Air Force, and defense agencies

and for the reserve components \$95,917,254.

I feel and others feel that this is just more money than we should have available to the Defense Department.

Most of it, \$600 million, is frozen.

Therefore the intent of this amendment is simply to require that they use \$300 million. We reduce the amount in this bill \$300 million so that they can use it from their frozen money.

Now they have said, and it is going to be argued, that they have agreed in fiscal 1967 that they are going to use this money that was frozen in 1966. Well, we are already practically through the first quarter of fiscal 1967, and this has not taken place.

We are going to have a supplemental early in January on military construction. If we can add some of these deferred projects, as long as they need to be constructed, along with these, I think we will be doing a real service to our fighting men in our armed services.

That is what this is designed to do.

I do not want to mislead anybody here. This is not going to cut the expenditure budget a dime—well, it might at that if they break loose some of these deferred projects while the cost of construction stays where it is. The longer they defer them the higher the cost of construction goes. It has gone from 5 to 8 percent already since the 1966 appropriation, and that is over \$30 million to do the same job that we could have done last year.

I do not think that this is good budgeting or good management. Therefore, I have offered this amendment in good faith for the simple purpose of jarring loose some of these deferred funds, and make them use it, rather than letting them have it lay around over in the Office of the Secretary of Defense.

I think this amendment is in the best interests of the military construction program and of our fighting men throughout the world. I know the chairman of the subcommittee is anxious to have these deferred projects go ahead. I realize there are some differences of opinion as to the method to do it. This is the method that we think will do the job.

Mr. SIKES. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. SIKES. Mr. Chairman, this is the most amazing amendment that I think has been offered on the floor this year. This amendment, regardless of what may be said about it and for it, proposes a 30-percent reduction in the smallest military construction program we have had in years, and every one of these projects selected on the basis of its essentiality for defense effort.

The bill has already been cut by 10 percent, and I will guarantee that that is enough. In fact, it may be too much. But now to take another 30 percent just does not stand to reason.

I would like for you to think back for a few moments. By contrast to this proposal, which would end in about a 30-percent cut in military construction,

including places for people in uniform to live and work while they get ready to fight the war in Vietnam for this country and for the free world, a while back we approved a budget for NASA, a \$5 billion budget, and do you know how much we cut it? Sixty-two million dollars, a little more than 1 percent.

Now, space exploration is important, but I do not think it is as important as winning the war in Vietnam. I do not think it is as important as maintaining the defense of this country. You cut the NASA budget, the space budget, by 1 percent, and it is proposed that we cut this one by 40 percent.

Oh, surely, my friends cannot be serious with an amendment like this.

The gentleman has discussed at length the amount of funds available from prior year appropriations. This does not have a thing in the world to do with the current barebones program. All of the money previously appropriated is earmarked money.

It can be used only for the purposes spelled out in the bills which were then passed, unless permission for reprogramming is given by Congress. This is no-year money. I know that. But it takes time to complete planning for the construction of individual projects.

Do you know that of this \$1 billion—the smallest military construction program we have had in years—\$511 million is for operation and maintenance and for required debt payments? It is not for building new facilities, not for building airports, runways, housing, barracks, training facilities. It is for operation and maintenance that has got to be paid whether or not anything can be built. These are required obligations. They cannot be deferred.

There is only a half billion dollars in this bill for new construction, and if you take out \$300 million, as this amendment proposes, you have left \$200 million, almost nothing. One could say that we might just as well forget the year's work and tell the people in uniform that we have no real interest in providing the facilities they need.

I know my friend does not intend that interpretation. I know exactly what he is doing. He has participated in all the discussions on this bill. He is a very valued and able member of the committee.

This amendment would mean that after we have spent all year marching up the hill and developing the best military construction program we could under the limited funds available, we would now turn around and march right back down, in effect destroying our efforts for the year. It is just as simple as that.

Mr. CEDERBERG. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SIKES. Let me make one further comment and then I will yield. I would like to call your attention to the fact that I have a letter from Deputy Secretary of Defense Cyrus Vance dated September 13, 1966. It is a long letter, and I shall not attempt to read all of it. In it he spells out again the essentiality of all the deferred projects.

He says they plan to build them as soon as they can. He spells out the essentiality of all the projects contained in the bill, and finally he says:

May I urge your support in overriding any move to reduce fiscal 1967 military construction appropriations because of fiscal 1966 deferrals.

Mr. WAGGONER. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Florida [Mr. SIKES] may proceed for 5 additional minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Louisiana?

There was no objection.

Mr. CEDERBERG. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SIKES. I yield to my friend from Michigan [Mr. CEDERBERG].

Mr. CEDERBERG. Mr. Chairman, certainly there is no difference in intent between the committee and myself. I feel this is a barebones military construction program. As a matter of fact, I do not believe it does enough, but, as the gentleman was talking about walking up and down the hill, we walked up the hill with the 1966 appropriation, and then the Defense Department froze it. We went up the hill and down the hill, and here we are again.

All I am trying to do is the best I know how to free the military construction funds, which are now frozen. If the gentleman knows any other way, I am perfectly willing to try it. I find nothing earmarked in the bill. The bill states, for example, "available until expended, \$146 million." All of our bills say the same thing. I say they have money in the Defense Department which we ought to far loose and unfreeze for these projects.

Mr. SIKES. I want it done, too. If anyone can tell me how it can be done I would appreciate it. I will join in mandatory language, if we can make it stick. I want it done. I want every project built that we have funded previously, that has been deferred and that is needed. I want the projects in this bill constructed. I feel, however, that if we adopt this amendment we are simply destroying this bill in a futile gesture, which will have no effect in forcing the Defense Department to do something it does not want to do.

I appreciate the contributions of my friend from Michigan. He is one of the ablest Members of the House. Certainly he has rendered yeoman service year after year in this program. I cannot understand how he would be found offering an amendment that in reality could destroy the year's work and jeopardize our chances to have even this barebones program for the next fiscal year.

Mr. CEDERBERG. Will the gentleman yield further?

Mr. SIKES. Yes, of course, I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. CEDERBERG. This amendment should pass. I am not suffering under too many illusions, but they will find this money and unfreeze it very quickly in the Defense Department. This is the quickest way I know to get this money unfrozen. They are going to build these

projects. They have plenty of money to do it. I am tired of having a mockery made of the appropriation process, of appropriating in 1966, and having them freeze money, and then having them come back here.

Mr. SIKES. I am too. But this is not the way to accomplish that. All of these funds and projects to me represent a hard core part of the 1967 defense program. The President's budget has scheduled these for obligation. The Department of Defense has time and again reconfirmed to the committee the military necessity for all of these projects. These projects have valid military requirements. They must be built. The only people we will hurt, if we take the money away from them, are those who are in uniform, the military personnel and their families.

I am sure my good friend will agree with me that construction has already been delayed longer than it should have been. We should not withhold construction further, particularly during a time when a war is going on.

I hope the amendment will be rejected.

Mr. CEDERBERG. I agree these projects are valid, but they are so valid that the Defense Department will not be building them. They just want the money to stay there.

Mr. SIKES. I trust my good friend will join with me in trying to find a better way than what he says his amendment will accomplish. It will not do the job.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Michigan.

The amendment was rejected.

The Clerk concluded the reading of the bill.

Mr. SIKES. Mr. Chairman, I move that the Committee do now rise and report the bill back to the House with the recommendation that the bill do pass.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly, the Committee rose; and the Speaker having resumed the chair, Mr. ULLMAN, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union, reported that that Committee, having had under consideration the bill (H.R. 17637) making appropriations for military construction for the Department of Defense for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1967, and for other purposes, had directed him to report the bill back to the House with the recommendation that the bill do pass.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, the previous question is ordered.

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, and was read the third time.

MOOTION TO RECOMMIT OFFERED BY MR. MORTON

Mr. MORTON. Mr. Speaker, I offer a motion to recommit.

The SPEAKER. Is the gentleman opposed to the bill?

Mr. MORTON. I am, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the motion to recommit.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. MORTON moves to recommit the bill to the Committee on Appropriations with instructions to that committee to report it back forthwith with the following amendment: On page 8, beginning on line 8, insert a new paragraph to read:

"Sec. 112. Appropriations made by this Act shall be reduced in an amount of not less than \$300,000,000 through the apportionment process as prescribed by law (31 U.S.C. 665)." And change section 112 to section 113.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, the previous question is ordered on the motion to recommit.

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the motion to recommit.

The motion to recommit was rejected.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the passage of the bill.

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. Mr. Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The question was taken; and there were—yeas 346, nays 3, not voting 83, as follows:

[Roll No. 284]

YEAS—346

Adair	Collier	Grover
Adams	Conte	Gubser
Addabbo	Cooley	Gurney
Anderson, Ill.	Corbett	Hagen, Calif.
Anderson, Tenn.	Craley	Haley
Andrews, George W.	Cramer	Hall
Andrews, N. Dak.	Culver	Halleck
Annunzio	Cunningham	Halpern
Arends	Curtis	Hamilton
Ashbrook	Daddario	Hanley
Ashley	Dague	Hanna
Ashmore	Daniels	Hansen, Iowa
Ayres	Davis, Wis.	Hansen, Wash.
Bandstra	Dawson	Hardy
Baring	de la Garza	Harsha
Barrett	Delaney	Harvey, Ind.
Bates	Denton	Harvey, Mich.
Battin	Derwinski	Hathaway
Beckworth	Dingell	Hays
Belcher	Dole	Hechler
Bell	Donohue	Henderson
Bennett	Dow	Herlong
Berry	Dowdy	Holifield
Betts	Downing	Hosmer
Bingham	Dulski	Howard
Blatnik	Duncan, Oreg.	Hull
Boggs	Duncan, Tenn.	Hungate
Bolling	Dwyer	Huot
Bolton	Dyal	Hutchinson
Bow	Edwards, Ala.	Ichord
Brademas	Edwards, La.	Irwin
Bray	Ellsworth	Jacobs
Brooks	Everett	Jarman
Broomfield	Evins, Tenn.	Jennings
Brown, Clarence J., Jr.	Farnum	Joelson
Broyhill, N.C.	Fascell	Johnson, Calif.
Broyhill, Va.	Feighan	Johnson, Okla.
Buchanan	Findley	Johnson, Pa.
Burke	Fino	Jonas
Burleson	Flood	Jones, Ala.
Burton, Calif.	Foley	Jones, Mo.
Burton, Utah	Ford, Gerald R.	Karsten
Byrne, Pa.	Ford, William D.	Kastenmeier
Byrnes, Wis.	Fountain	Kee
Cabell	Fraser	Keith
Cahill	Frelinghuysen	Kelly
Callan	Fulton, Pa.	Keogh
Callaway	Fulton, Tenn.	King, Calif.
Cameron	Fuqua	King, Utah
Carey	Gathings	Kirwan
Carter	Gettys	Kluczynski
Casey	Gibbons	Kornegay
Cederberg	Gilbert	Krebs
Chamberlain	Gilligan	Kunkel
Chelf	Gonzalez	Kupferman
Clark	Goodell	Laird
Clausen, Don H.	Grabowski	Langen
Clawson, Del.	Gray	Latta
Cleveland	Green, Oreg.	Leggett
Clevenger	Green, Pa.	Lennon
Cohelan	Greigg	Lipcomb
	Grider	Love
	Grimms	McCarthy
	Gross	McClure
		McCulloch
		McDade

McDowell	Pickle	Smith, Calif.
McEwen	Pike	Smith, Iowa
McFall	Pirnie	Smith, N.Y.
McGrath	Poage	Smith, Va.
McVicker	Poff	Springer
Macdonald	Pool	Stafford
MacGregor	Powell	Staggers
Machen	Price	Stalbaum
Mackay	Pucinski	Stanton
Mackie	Purcell	Steed
Mahon	Quillen	Stubblefield
Mailliard	Race	Sullivan
Marsh	Randall	Sweeney
Martin, Nebr.	Redlin	Talcott
Mathias	Reid, Ill.	Taylor
Matsunaga	Reid, N.Y.	Teague, Calif.
Matthews	Reifel	Teague, Tex.
May	Reuss	Thomas
Meeds	Rhodes, Ariz.	Thompson, N.J.
Michel	Rhodes, Pa.	Thompson, Tex.
Miller	Rivers, S.C.	Thomson, Wis.
Minish	Rivers, Alaska	Tuck
Mink	Roberts	Tunney
Minshall	Robison	Tupper
Mize	Rodino	Ullman
Moeller	Rogers, Colo.	Utt
Monagan	Rogers, Fla.	Vanik
Moore	Ronan	Vigorito
Moorhead	Rooney, N.Y.	Vivian
Morgan	Rooney, Pa.	Waggonner
Morse	Rosenthal	Waldie
Mosher	Rostenkowski	Watkins
Moss	Roudebush	Watson
Murphy, Ill.	Roush	Watts
Murphy, N.Y.	Rumsfeld	Whalley
Natcher	Ryan	White, Tex.
Nedzi	Satterfield	Whitener
Nelsen	St. Onge	Whitten
Nix	Saylor	Widnall
O'Brien	Scheuer	Williams
O'Hara, Ill.	Schisler	Wilson, Bob
O'Hara, Mich.	Schmidhauser	Wilson
Olsen, Mont.	Schneebell	Charles H.
Olson, Minn.	Schwelker	Wolff
O'Neal, Ga.	Scott	Wright
Ottinger	Secrest	Wyatt
Passman	Selden	Wylder
Patman	Shipley	Yates
Patten	Shriver	Young
Pepper	Sikes	Younger
Perkins	Skubitz	Zablocki
Philbin	Slack	

NAYS—3

Brown, Calif.	Long, Md.	Morton
---------------	-----------	--------

NOT VOTING—83

Abbutt	Fisher	O'Konski
Abernethy	Flynt	O'Neill, Mass.
Albert	Fogarty	Pelly
Andrews	Friedel	Quie
Glenn	Gallagher	Rees
Aspinall	Garmatz	Reinecke
Boland	Hagan, Ga.	Resnick
Brock	Hansen, Idaho	Rogers, Tex.
Celler	Hawkins	Roncalio
Clancy	Hébert	Roybal
Colmer	Helstoski	St Germain
Conable	Hicks	Senner
Conyers	Holland	Sickles
Corman	Horton	Sisk
Curtin	Jones, N.C.	Stephens
Davis, Ga.	Karth	Stratton
Dent	King, N.Y.	Tenzer
Devine	Landrum	Todd
Dickinson	Long, La.	Toil
Diggs	McMillan	Trimble
Dorn	Madden	Tuten
Edmondson	Martin, Ala.	Udall
Edwards, Calif.	Martin, Mass.	Van Deerlin
Erlenborn	Mills	Walker, Miss.
Evans, Colo.	Morris	Walker, N. Mex.
Fallon	Morrison	Weltner
Farbstein	Multer	White, Idaho
Farnsley	Murray	Willis

So the bill was passed.

The Clerk announced the following pairs:

Mr. Hébert with Mr. King of New York.
 Mr. O'Neill of Massachusetts with Mr. Martin of Massachusetts.
 Mr. Fogarty with Mr. O'Konski.
 Mr. Celler with Mr. Curtin.
 Mr. Hagan of Georgia with Mr. Glenn Andrews.
 Mr. Davis of Georgia with Mr. Walker of Mississippi.
 Mr. St Germain with Mr. Brock.
 Mr. Boland with Mr. Conable.
 Mr. Hicks with Mr. Quie.

Mr. Abernethy with Mr. Dickinson.
 Mr. Colmer with Mr. Martin of Alabama.
 Mr. Garmatz with Mr. Devine.
 Mr. Friedel with Mr. Pelly.
 Mr. Fallon with Mr. Horton.
 Mr. Farbstein with Mr. Reinecke.
 Mr. Sickles with Mr. Hansen of Idaho.
 Mr. Sisk with Mr. Erlenborn.
 Mr. Morrison with Mr. Clancy.
 Mr. Rees with Mr. Diggs.
 Mr. Evans of Colorado with Mr. Conyers.
 Mr. Roncalio with Mr. Madden.
 Mr. Roybal with Mr. Long of Louisiana.
 Mr. Resnick with Mr. Landrum.
 Mr. Stratton with Mr. Helstoski.
 Mr. White of Idaho with Mr. Holland.
 Mr. Hawkins with Mr. Senner.
 Mr. Morris with Mr. Todd.
 Mr. Multer with Mr. Tuten.
 Mr. Albert with Mr. Tenzer.
 Mr. Stephens with Mr. Walker of New Mexico.
 Mr. Karth with Mr. Willis.
 Mr. Trimble with Mr. Dorn.
 Mr. Van Deerlin with Mr. Abbutt.
 Mr. Weltner with Mr. Corman.
 Mr. Gallagher with Mr. McMillan.
 Mr. Rogers of Texas with Mr. Murray.
 Mr. Dent with Mr. Edwards of California.
 Mr. Flynt with Mr. Farnsley.
 Mr. Mills with Mr. Fisher.
 Mr. Aspinall with Mr. Edmondson.
 Mr. Jones of North Carolina with Mr. Udall.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. SIKES. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to extend their own remarks on the bill just passed and to include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Florida?

There was no objection.

AMENDMENT OF NATIONAL SCHOOL LUNCH ACT

Mr. COOLEY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's desk the bill (S. 3467) to amend the National School Lunch Act, as amended, to strengthen and expand food service programs for children, with the House amendment thereto, insist on the amendment of the House, and agree to the conference asked by the Senate.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from North Carolina? The Chair hears none, and appoints the following conferees: Messrs. COOLEY, POAGE, GATHINGS, HAGEN of California, PURCELL, BELCHER, QUIE, and Mrs. MAY.

ANTIRIOT ACT

Mr. WHITTEN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute, to revise and extend my remarks, and to include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Mississippi?

There was no objection.

Mr. WHITTEN. Mr. Speaker, as a former district attorney in Mississippi,

one willing to match my record for the fair discharge of my obligations as an officer with that of anyone, I deplore what has happened in my city of Grenada. I have no personal knowledge of what happened yesterday and the day before in one of the finest small cities in the country, Grenada, Miss., which is so close by as to be like my hometown.

Mr. Speaker, I do know that for months now outside agitators, with the acquiescence if not the approval of the U.S. Department of Justice, have been doing everything they could think of to bring about riot and bloodshed. They have stood in the public square, hurling epithets, screaming filthy and obscene language, with representatives of the Department of Justice in the area and almost in the position of supervising these efforts to incite to riot. I have pointed out this situation on several occasions.

NONVIOLENCE TAKES MORE THAN WORDS

Saying the word "nonviolence" while acting in a manner and in concert with other actions on the part of the speaker or his associates, the logical and easy to anticipate results of which are to incite violence, you know and I know is to incite violence. Yet that is what has occurred regularly.

I join with Senator BYRD, of Virginia, in suggesting that it is time the Attorney General resigned. From the day when Chief Justice Warren, former Republican Governor of California, and his associates on the Supreme Court changed all the prior decisions of the judges who preceded him, and President Eisenhower backed him up with troops and bayonets, we have seen the Supreme Court render decision after decision supposedly protecting individuals but actually tying the hands of the police and local law enforcement officers, and permitting or releasing criminals upon a defenseless public—again with the support and, at times, on what amounts to petition of the Attorney General. I have addressed myself to this matter on several occasions, the last time on August 18, page 19965 of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD:

ANTIRIOT ACT

Mr. WHITTEN. Mr. Speaker, the one action which we have taken in quite a long time which could be a start toward a return of law and order was the anti-riot amendment, for which I made the concluding oral argument on the floor, section 502, of the so-called Civil Rights Act of 1966, page 18470, CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of August 8, 1966.

This amendment, offered by the gentleman from Florida [Mr. CRAMER], provides:

"PROTECTION OF RIGHTS

"SEC. 502. Whoever moves or travels in interstate or foreign commerce or uses any facility in interstate or foreign commerce, including the mail, with intent to—

"(1) incite, promote, encourage, or carry on, or facilitate the incitement, promotion, encouragement, or carrying on of, a riot or other violent civil disturbance; or

"(2) commit any crime of violence, arson, bombing, or other act which is a felony or high misdemeanor under Federal or State law, in furtherance of, or during commission of, any act specified in paragraph (1); or

"(3) assist, encourage, or instruct any person to commit or perform any act specified in paragraphs (1) and (2);

and thereafter performs or attempts to perform any act specified in paragraphs (1), (2), and (3), shall be fined not more than \$10,000 or imprisoned not more than five years, or both."

"And renumber the following section accordingly."

Mr. Speaker, the chief significance of the adoption of this amendment is that it shows that the Members of this House are at last showing some signs that they realize this Nation is about to be destroyed unless we restore law and order.

This provision is a sound one. I hope the Senate will adopt it as separate legislation. Under the administration of the present Attorney General, however, I doubt that much would be done to enforce its provisions. Actually if the Federal authorities would let law enforcement function, no such statute would be needed, for, Mr. Speaker, the various States, including my own State of Mississippi, have statutes against rioting or inciting to riot. Our local law-enforcement officers could maintain order now under State law, if the Department of Justice and other Federal authorities would allow the local courts to function; if they would accept the facts, easily proven, and known to the people of the Nation, which are that professional agitators are busy stirring up strife, doing everything they can to cause riots. They say nonviolence while doing exactly that which leads to violence. To promote violence is not peaceful, but must be accepted as overt acts toward inciting a riot.

For many weeks now the people of one of the fine towns or cities in my district, Grenada, almost like a home to me, since I grew up about 14 miles from there, have been the target of almost every kind of inflammatory action, of vile language, of epithets, the natural result of which would lead to fights, bloodshed, and property damage.

Similar but worse situations have happened and are happening all over the United States—Cleveland, Omaha, Providence, Brooklyn, Amityville, New York, and many, many others, including, of course, Chicago, which has been in the forefront of the news—for repeated outbreaks have been the order of the day and night. The Nation now sees this is far more than a southern problem.

Mr. Speaker, my town of Grenada has many fine people, sound people, and I know has excellent legal and other leadership; and, not being able to be on the ground regularly I have hesitated to advise. Now, however, I believe the time has come where the people of the Nation realize that cities, counties, and other political subdivisions must be permitted to seek and secure restraining orders against all persons known to have gone from place to place to stir up hatred, prejudice, while attempting to wreck the local economy—particularly where they have incited riots on a small if not a large scale at other points.

Mr. Speaker, I spoke on the so-called Civil Rights Act of 1966 on July 25, July 29, August 2, and August 4, pointing out its fallacies and detailing just what we in the South have been up against for quite a long time: violence which has now spread to all sections of the country. What we need is to get the Federal Government to leave local law officers alone to discharge their duties, for law enforcement is a local and not a national responsibility—one for which the Nation is not prepared. We need to let our municipalities go into the courts and obtain court assistance to keep the peace by restraining orders.

If this had been permitted in Grenada, the events of the last few days need not have occurred.

Mr. Speaker, what we have is a breakdown in law and order which will get worse unless

those charged with the responsibility of keeping the peace, make full use of the policemen on the ground, backed up by the local courts, State and Federal. If we do not do that, we are in for chaos and all the excuses offered by the Attorney General or other officials would not change what we are in for.

I understand that such a restraining order against these would-be marchers, these people who do everything to incite riots while talking nonviolence, has been issued in one section of Chicago. That Mr. Speaker, is what we need to be permitted to do in my town of Grenada where the people have had to put up with every rotten thing possible, filthy language, insults, lawsuits, and everything else—as part of an effort to wreck overall economy of Negro and white. Mr. Speaker, this is but a move toward anarchy. Federal authorities must move back and let law enforcement, in Grenada and across the Nation, function if we are to handle the situation.

In debate on the so-called Civil Rights Act of 1966, I pointed out in some detail that what we have is a breakdown in law and order. One of my speeches on the subject was the basis of an editorial by the Mobile Register, which I quote here:

"TIME TO WAKE UP AND QUIT FIDDLING

"Some things said in Congress the other day by Representative JAMIE L. WHITTEN of Mississippi were remindful of that familiar phrase about fiddling while Rome burns.

"The American people," he said, "have had enough of trials being delayed, the guilty going free on technicalities, property being destroyed, our police being pushed around.

"They have a right to expect us to do something to restore law and order, for involved is the destruction of responsible government."

"Here we are with the greatest wave of lawlessness facing our country all across the land, and yet the Congress, which should take to heart its own responsibility, is busy spending days and days protecting the rights of the irresponsible to serve on juries. Now, is that not a ridiculous thing for us to do, when we should be busy trying to make punishment for crime more certain?"

"Mr. WHITTEN, continuing to emphasize the problem of lawlessness in the fact of inadequate effort to stamp it out, told his colleagues:

"We find in today's newspaper reports from at least eight or 10 states throughout the nation where on yesterday criminals were running wild, destroying lives and property."

"We see on every hand the court's getting away from the rule on which orderly government was built, a general rule to the effect that if the record clearly showed the guilt of the defendant beyond a reasonable doubt, he or she would not be released on the public on some technicality and particularly a technicality raised by the appellate or Supreme Court itself."

"... It is said that Nero fiddled while Rome burned. It strikes me that is about what we are doing here."

"At a time when our country is becoming the victim of the criminal, when our wives and daughters and we ourselves are afraid to walk our streets, we find the Congress spending these hours and days trying to protect the rights of irresponsible persons to sit on a jury."

"We need to do something about crime and criminals. We need to make punishment more certain. We need to put the rights of an orderly and lawabiding society ahead of the whims of the Supreme Court..."

"It is time to wake up here and quit fiddling. Rome is certainly burning, and if you do not believe it, read today's newspapers."

"There is a glaring misfortune in regard to remarks such as Mr. WHITTEN made in Congress in this instance. The misfortune is remarks of this kind are not made by enough

members of Congress and enough other Americans."

"But no American with his eyes open should fail to see that it is time to wake up and quit fiddling."

"As a postscript to Mr. WHITTEN's remarks, we call attention to this excerpt from a Chicago dispatch at weekend by United Press International:

"Hoodlums broke windows in a suburban department store and stole 24 rifles and shotguns from displays after a rampage of violence during which a policeman was shot by a sniper."

"More proof that the time has come in the United States to wake up and quit fiddling. Not only is it time to wake up and quit fiddling—the need for that is acute, urgent, imperative. The longer the delay, the greater and more alarming the danger."

"Why the delay—why the reluctance to take urgently needed action with courage, forthrightness and resolution? Two prime factors in why this action is not taken are: Stupidity and politics. The American people cannot afford the brands of stupidity and politics that leave them exposed to the violence and crime of the lawless."

Mr. Speaker, I repeat, there is only one way to save this country of ours and that is for the Attorney General, the Department of Justice, and the Federal courts to back up local law-enforcement officers, instead of nullifying their efforts. If some change is not soon made, you will have no policemen for no one would have the job. Conditions will border on that of the Middle Ages where it was every man for himself—and there was little for anyone.

That was on August 18. Today it is apparent that the Attorney General must move in on these agitators who create riots, who spent weeks building up to what we have seen happen all over the country. From statements made by the present Attorney General, it is apparent he will not do that. Again, I agree with Senator BYRD. We need an Attorney General who does not condone agitation and agitators, until violence erupts, and blood is shed, one who recognizes the right of local people to secure injunction to restrain agitators, not merely in Chicago but in the small towns of the South. His appeasement policy of offering up the South to illiterate voters, to the withholding of funds from schools by the Department of Education, under laws passed here by the joint action of Republican and Democratic leaders has failed.

Chaos threatens, not in my section, but in the cities of the Nation, and the powers that be refuse to recognize the fact.

THE STATE OF INDIANA IS NOW COOPERATING FULLY WITH THE FEDERAL GOVERNMENT IN PROJECTS FOR THE BENEFIT OF ITS PEOPLE

Mr. DENTON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Indiana?

There was no objection.

Mr. DENTON. Mr. Speaker, as you may well be aware the State of Indiana for many years adhered to a policy of not wanting, or accepting, any help from the Federal Government.

Because of this the Hoosier State suffered through many floods—without plans for flood control work. The people of Indiana were deprived of many other projects sponsored by the Federal Government, too, because each time those of us in Congress appealed for funds to help our State we were reminded of the State's attitude.

Today this has all changed. The State of Indiana is now cooperating fully with the Federal Government in projects for the benefit of its people.

I think that an editorial in the *Corydon Democrat* of August 24, 1966, puts forth quite succinctly the change that has taken place in the relationship of Indiana and the Federal Government.

I recommend this article for reading by my colleagues and include it here as an extension of my remarks:

INDIANA HAS STANDING IN WASHINGTON

Contrasted with the situation which prevailed in 1947 and for a number of years afterward, relations between the Indiana and Federal government are better. Both the bureaucracy and the Congress in Washington have shown their attitude toward Indiana greatly improved.

It was in 1947 that the Indiana General Assembly adopted a resolution which warned the Federal Congress, the President and the departments of government in the Nation's Capital saying that Indiana wanted no part of Federal funds and Federal projects.

Although funds for the land-grant colleges, including Purdue, and funds used in Indiana for a number of other well-accepted services had been coming from the Federal government for a number of years, the 1947 Indiana Legislature sent word to Washington that a majority of the Indiana legislators were opposed to the idea of using any more Federal government funds in Indiana. The resolution said that there is great danger in Federal control which inevitably comes with Federal funds.

A great many changes have occurred since that time. Possibly a majority of citizens of Indiana believed then, as the legislature's resolution stated, that Indiana should not accept the Federal money.

The 1961 session of Indiana's General Assembly adopted a new resolution pointing out that Indiana, like most other states, does want to cooperate and participate in federal-state programs.

During the years between 1947 and 1961 Indiana citizens, including Indiana's members of the National House of Representatives and the United States Senate were reminded of the 1947 resolution. The relations between the Indiana government and the United States government were not good; they left much to be desired. During the years of the Eisenhower administration while Indiana had Senators Capehart and Jenner in the U.S. Senate, nine Republican Congressmen and only two Democratic Congressmen—DENTON and MADDEN—Indiana was almost completely "left out in the cold". The poor relations between the State of Indiana and the United States government cost the citizens of Indiana many losses in projects in which the businesses of the Hoosier State should have participated.

The change from a situation of strained relations to a situation of cooperation has taken time. But a lot of good progress has been made.

George Gettinger, liaison man and expeditor in the Indiana office in Washington reports that bureaucrats as well as elected officials are taking a friendly attitude toward Indiana. Mr. Gettinger was in Croydon Aug. 12 and 13. During his fifteen months in Washington as a representative of Indiana

business and industry, Mr. Gettinger has found that Indiana Senators HARTKE and BAYH and all of the State's eleven Congressmen, both Republicans and Democrats, recently have been getting cordial acceptance in most of the offices of the Federal government.

This is of value to citizens all along the line. Those who receive government contracts prosper, and in bringing more business to Indiana other citizens also indirectly are benefitted. Mr. Gettinger says that now "the climate is good" for Indiana in Washington. We all hope that it may be kept that way and new friendships and contacts made.

DEMOCRATIC PLATFORM OF ILLINOIS

Mr. O'HARA of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

Mr. O'HARA of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, under permission granted to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD, I include the text of the dynamic and challenging platform of the Democratic Party of Illinois adopted at the Democratic State Convention in Chicago on September 9, 1966:

PLATFORM—THE DEMOCRATIC PARTY OF ILLINOIS 1966: STATEMENT OF PRINCIPLES

Throughout its history the guideposts of the Democratic Party have been to meet the challenges of the present and the future and not to be deterred from positive action by the shadows of the past.

The Democratic Party of Illinois can be proud of its leadership in converting promises into reality . . . of never being satisfied with the status quo . . . of facing courageously up to the problems of changing times.

Without regard to expediency it has served the needs of all citizens . . . of every race, creed, color, and national origin . . . of every economic status and occupation.

The Democratic Party of Illinois supports the world policy of President Lyndon B. Johnson that the security of this nation and its Constitutional guarantees of freedom cannot be isolated from the forces of tyranny and communism which would engulf the world. The battlefields of Viet Nam may be thousands of miles away, but world peace affects every family. The great issues there being contested directly concern the future of us all.

It is for the future as well as the present that the Democratic Party has expanded economic opportunities . . . defended individual freedoms . . . led the cause of labor . . . advanced community welfare . . . and broadened educational opportunities.

We believe in the victory of peace . . . and the triumph of understanding. Working together as true Democrats, as a party united by our faith in the people and inspired by their faith in us, we shall continue to strive for the goal set by President Lyndon B. Johnson . . . the Great Society.

ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT

The Democratic Party is proud of the assistance and leadership which Governor Kerner's new Department of Business and Economic Development has provided to the communities throughout the State in planning their urban growth and industrial development.

Under Democratic leadership tens of thousands of new job opportunities have been

created—many in the State's previously industrially deprived areas. The Governor's program to attract new and retain existing industries is of vital importance to the economy of our State.

All of the citizens of our State benefit directly from Illinois' leading position in international trade. The economy of Illinois has also benefitted because of Governor Kerner's programs in the field of tourism. The promotion of the State's natural, cultural, and historical assets has not only provided thousands of visitors with enriching experiences, but has contributed directly to increasing employment and the strengthening of our economy.

RULE OF LAW

The Democratic Party endorses the concept that it is only through the respect for law that justice for all can be attained in a civilized society.

The Democratic Party is proud of the leadership and courage which has been symbolized by Mayor Richard J. Daley in his determined effort to preserve law and order within the City of Chicago, while at the same time protecting the constitutional rights of all citizens.

We pledge our untiring efforts to oppose the extreme tactics of such organizations as the Communist Party, Nazi Party, the Ku Klux Klan and the John Birch Society, which under the guise of freedom and patriotism seek to destroy the rights and liberties guaranteed to the individual under the United States Constitution.

ANTICRIME MEASURES

The Democratic Party of Illinois pledges to support legislation which is needed to aid law enforcement agencies in their fight against crime.

The Democratic Party of Illinois points with pride to the record of achievement resulting from the efforts of the Mayor's Committee on Anticrime Measures. Unprecedented advances have been made such as making syndicate gambling a major crime; affording immunity to grand jury witnesses and requiring their testimony; increasing the term of the grand jury to allow more effective probes of organized crime; making it a major crime to harass or intimidate witnesses and jurors; increasing the penalty for conspiracy and intimidation (juice racket).

We pledge to continue our efforts to secure the enactment of a court supervised wiretapping law with sufficient safeguards to protect the rights of individual private citizens.

We will continue to support the Illinois Crime Commission and other governmental agencies in their fight against organized crime.

GUN CONTROL

Possession of guns by irresponsible individuals presents a most significant threat to the safety of all the citizens. For too long a time this menace to law-abiding citizens has remained unregulated and unchecked. Recent events throughout the country have demonstrated the tragic consequences which result from the uncontrolled, uncensored, unrestricted opportunity to purchase and possess firearms. The Democratic Party of Illinois believes an effective legislation must be enacted to license and regulate the purchase and possession of guns. We pledge ourselves to work toward a meaningful program of firearms control in the State and Nation.

SCHOOLS

Recognizing that the greatest resource of any state is its youth, the Democratic Party believes in providing the best possible education for the children of Illinois.

The Democratic Party supports the expansion of elementary and high school, junior college, and university facilities, faculties and curricula, to meet the great increase in student enrollment that will take place in the coming years.

We support the provision of greater educational opportunities for pre-school children, adolescents and adults, including the development of opportunities for vocational, technical and trade education for all youth and adults; the extension and enrichment of instructional and counseling services to students with special needs; and the extension of higher education with appropriate consideration for development of community colleges, as well as public and private colleges and universities. We favor the maximum use of existing non-public colleges and universities through an extension of the present state scholarship program. We support the free choice principle for all state scholarships or their equivalent.

We believe in the maintenance of local control of schools by helping local school systems build stronger programs and by responsible fulfillment of individual roles in the local-state-federal partnership.

We believe that the quality of instruction is improved by maintaining high standards for teachers, through the betterment of teacher working conditions and welfare, and by assisting the teacher to fulfill his responsibility for open inquiry in the pursuit of knowledge.

We hold the welfare of the youth of Illinois to be of such great importance that we favor the creation of a State Board of Education and the appointment of the State Superintendent of Public Instruction so that the making of educational policy will be placed in the hands of the people, the professional field of educational administration at the state level will be raised.

We commend Governor Otto Kerner for his leadership in the field of education, and for the fact that under his administration the state of Illinois, for the first time in history, devotes a greater share of its budget to education than for any other purpose.

We commend Governor Kerner's establishment of a Board of Higher Education and pledge our continued support of his programs for gifted children, vocational training and a tutoring corps for drop-outs.

After a decade of unjustifiable opposition by Republican leadership, the children of Chicago were granted the same transportation aid from the State which for years had been given to all other children within the State. We urge the General Assembly to continue this program of equality of treatment for all the school children in Illinois.

RECREATION

With the growth of population and the expansion of urbanization, there is a vital need for the greatest opportunity for recreational and leisure time activities.

The Democratic Party will continue to expand and intensify the program of acquiring open space and preserving recreational resources in the communities and throughout the state for future generations.

There is urgent need for immediate acquisition of recreational areas if we are to provide for the present and future recreational needs for our citizens.

HIGHWAY SAFETY

We deplore the needless loss of lives resulting from traffic fatalities.

The Democratic Party urges legislation which will create higher safety standards for all vehicles to accompany the program of driver education and strict obedience to traffic regulations. We laud the efforts of President Lyndon Johnson, Secretary of State Powell, the Governor's Traffic Safety Committee, as well as local efforts, to bring about meaningful recommendations related to ways and means of coping with this vital problem.

SENIOR CITIZENS

We believe that every American is entitled to enjoy his later years in the comfort and dignity which his contribution to America's progress and development merits.

We pledge to continue programs providing for expanded housing, health, vocational and recreational services for our senior citizens. We favor improved programs for physical rehabilitation and intensified medical research specializing in geriatrics.

We commend the programs pioneered by Mayor Daley and the City of Chicago, in cooperation with the Federal government, in providing low and moderate income housing to meet the special needs of senior citizens and the programs of guidance and recreational services which have been instituted and urge their expansion.

HEALTH AND MEDICARE

The Democratic Party takes pride in the passage and implementation of medical care for the aged under Social Security. We salute Senator PAUL DOUGLAS for his long and valiant fight for Medicare on behalf of the senior citizens of the nation to whom the adoption of this program means so much. The achievement of this long-time Democratic program now guarantees for all our citizens low-cost hospital and nursing care in their old age.

The Democratic Party recognizes the significant achievements of a national administration in providing assistance for hospital expansion, medical training and programs of research.

MENTAL HEALTH

The Democratic Party has provided outstanding leadership at state and local levels in the field of mental health. The development of community in-patient and out-patient clinics throughout the state bring mental health services closer to the people, thereby providing earlier treatment for the mentally ill and the mentally retarded. We pledge to continue our efforts to meet the critical need for more trained personnel in all of the varied health programs now being carried on throughout the state.

HOME RULE

The Democratic Party of Illinois believes that local government is best administered by those officials who are elected specifically to manage local affairs and who are directly responsible to the people affected by their administration.

Adequate police and fire protection in all of the cities of Illinois demands additional personnel and the payment of sufficient wages to attract competent and dedicated persons to this important governmental career.

We recommend the adoption of legislation which will give to local municipal officials the authority to raise necessary revenues to carry out their responsibilities in the areas of police and fire as well as other governmental services.

MILITARY PREFERENCE

The Democratic Party believes that those brave young Americans fighting against Communism and for freedom in Viet Nam deserve the same preference in government employment, which has been given to valiant Americans who have fought in previous military conflicts. We urge the enactment of legislation which will provide for this preferential treatment in hiring veterans of the Viet Nam conflict.

REVENUE

The Democratic Party of Illinois supports the adoption of the Revenue Article which will provide for a more equitable treatment of the small homeowner and taxpayer by permitting the classification of property for tax purposes.

The Democratic Party recognizes that to achieve a tax structure which will be equitable to all segments of our economy requires further study and action by the State Legislature.

We urge the General Assembly to give high priority to the needs of local governments

for additional powers to raise revenues for local government services.

The Democratic Party of Illinois opposes a State income tax.

LABOR

The Democratic Party takes great pride in the strength of the economy which currently provides a measure of employment never before experienced in the history of our country.

The Democratic Party of Illinois favors the establishment of a State minimum wage law. We urge the adoption of pending legislation in the Congress of the United States to broaden the coverage of the Federal minimum wage law and to increase the minimum wage.

We oppose the so-called "right-to-work" legislation and any other measures designed to destroy effective representation of workers through their unions.

The Democratic Party supports the principle of collective bargaining agreements for governmental employees, provided that there be proper safeguards prohibiting the right to strike against government.

We support the principle of equal pay for equal work—regardless of sex.

We commend business, labor and all elements of the community for their efforts in meeting the challenge of automation and the advances of science and technology in such a manner that the benefits of the new technology will be enjoyed in an economy where unemployment is at its all-time low.

We commend the leadership of the Democratic Party for encouraging voluntary efforts to achieve merit employment by private industry in an atmosphere of understanding, mutual cooperation, and genuine and sincere commitment. We commend the leaders of both business and labor for their participation in this endeavor.

HUMAN RIGHTS

The Democratic Party pays tribute to the leadership of President Lyndon B. Johnson, Senator PAUL H. DOUGLAS and the Democratic Members of the Congress for the foresight and leadership involved in securing the passage of the Civil Rights Acts of 1964 and 1965—significant steps forward in achieving equality of citizenship for all Americans. We urge the Congress to adopt the pending Civil Rights Act of 1966. The Democratic Party takes great pride in the enactment, after years of a hard fought struggle against the reactionary thinking of the Republican Party, of a Fair Employment Practices Act. The Democratic Party pledges itself to work for the strengthening of this law by expanding its coverage to provide equal employment opportunities for all people, and to broaden the powers of the Commission to include the right to initiate action against discrimination wherever it is found.

The Democratic Party takes pride in the leadership of Governor Kerner and Mayor Daley in their efforts to secure a fair housing market by the regulation of the real estate industry in the City of Chicago and throughout the State of Illinois.

The Democratic Party pledges to continue its efforts to secure for all people regardless of race, creed or national origin, equal opportunities in employment, schools, hospitals, housing and public accommodations.

The Democratic Party of Illinois endorses the farsighted program initiated under the leadership of outstanding religious, business, labor, civic, community and civil rights leaders who, in conjunction with Mayor Richard J. Daley and other political leaders, will seek to end the unscrupulous practice of exploiting racial change for profit through blockbusting and panic tactics. We support the effort to substitute therefor, through competent and conscientious top level personnel, a program of education, and opportunity so that all persons in the entire metropolitan area will have opportunities to obtain housing of their choice within their

economic means without artificial barriers. The program which is receiving steady approval throughout the country is a significant development under Democratic leadership in Illinois.

PROTECTION OF THE CONSUMER

The Democratic Party of Illinois charges the Republican Party with wilful disregard for the plight of the thousands of victims of unprincipled merchants who have brazenly exploited and victimized them through unscrupulous credit practices and inferior merchandise. We commend the Democratic leadership of the House and Senate of Illinois for their efforts in studying the problems involved in consumer sales and credit transactions, and for the comprehensive program which they proposed during the 1965 Session of the General Assembly in an effort to cure these ills. We pledge to renew our high priority for a legislative program designed to curb abuses in this area and secure fair and equitable credit laws for the State of Illinois.

The life savings, security and protection of thousands of our citizens are dependent upon the soundness and stability of insurance companies and savings and loan associations. To expand the protection given to the public in Illinois, the Democratic Party urges the adoption of legislation which will protect all citizens against the result of possible insolvency and liquidation. We will once again urge the enactment of legislation which will provide for more adequate personnel to guarantee needed supervision and auditing of the insurance and banking industry in Illinois.

MASS TRANSPORTATION

Expansion and improvement of our mass transportation systems is vital to the economy and well being of our cities and state. We commend the efforts of the Federal government in providing financial assistance for the construction of mass transit facilities. We urge both the State and Federal governments to aid the improvement of this essential service.

AGRICULTURE

The Democratic Party is proud of its efforts, with the leadership of Governor Otto Kerner and his outstanding administration in bringing Illinois up to and in keeping Illinois the number one agricultural export state in the nation.

The Democratic Party realizes that in this latter half of the 20th century the organizational concept of agriculture—production on land—is now only one segment of the entire vast industry. The original concept of agriculture goes far beyond the concern with production of food and fiber. Today it must include production, processing, distribution, utilization and consumption. The operation of each segment of this system requires high degrees of technical skill, involves employment of vast numbers of people and directly affects the total economic stability of our state as well as our great nation.

The Democratic Party, above all, stresses upon the consuming public the vast ever-expanding importance of its agriculture assets to Illinois in total economy and more specifically, to every individual's standard of living.

We urge the enactment of legislation to concentrate upon improving quality control programs, such as livestock disease control, grain inspection, feeds, fertilizers and standards, and to develop further expansion of markets, both at home and abroad, so that the Illinois farmer may share in this abundance and our prosperous economy.

In conclusion, the Democratic Party realizes the importance of the Port of Chicago, the largest inland seaport, urges no increase of tolls on the St. Lawrence Seaway, and requests that the subject of eventual elimina-

tion of tolls be considered as in the international interest of this great seaway.

AIR AND WATER POLLUTION

The welfare of our citizens is dependent upon the cleanliness of our air and the purity of our water. Illinois has taken the commanding position in adopting regulatory legislation in the fields of air and water pollution control. We compliment the City of Chicago under the leadership of Mayor Richard J. Daley for its model ordinances in these vital fields.

The Democratic Party of Illinois pledges its full support to Federal and State programs of instituting the highest standards of protection and most rigid control of pollution of our air and water.

ANNUAL SESSIONS

The Democratic Party of Illinois favors annual sessions of the legislature. At a time when the needs of a great and growing state are pressing for solution we can no longer continue with a system so hopelessly out of date.

CONSTITUTIONAL CONVENTION

The Democratic Party renews its support of a resolution calling for a Constitutional Convention. We do not believe the rigid structure and cumbersome detail of a document almost 100 years old are suitable for today's needs.

SHERIFFS AND COUNTY TREASURERS

The Democratic Party of Illinois urges the adoption of the Constitutional Amendment which will allow sheriffs and county treasurers to succeed themselves.

BANKING ACT

The Democratic Party urges approval of the changes in the Banking Act which are to be voted upon in the election to be held November 8th.

LEGISLATIVE REFERENCE SERVICE—RESEARCH ARM OF THE CONGRESS

Mr. OLSEN of Montana. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Montana?

There was no objection.

Mr. OLSEN of Montana. Mr. Speaker, the determination of Congress to strengthen its research arm—the Legislative Reference Service—is evident in recent actions taken by the House and Senate Appropriations Committees as well as by the Joint Committee on the Organization of the Congress. Recognition by the Members of the present and potential value of the Legislative Reference Service in meeting their research requirements is also evident in the increased appropriations for fiscal 1967, an amount which will permit the employment of some 35 additional researchers. It is clear from the history of the Legislative Branch Appropriations for 1967 that the Legislative Reference Service is widely regarded as performing a valuable role in the legislative process, one which should be strongly supported so that requests for research and analysis or for reference work can be handled promptly and efficiently.

One can almost say that Congress "paused for station identification" before taking the recent positive actions

with regard to its research organization—the Legislative Reference Service. We did not have to pause too long before finding in the past those guiding principles set forth in the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946. Nor did we pause too long before deciding that after 20 years we needed to expand our guiding directives in the light of past and present experience, and particularly as we looked toward the future when Congress—its Members and committees—would face ever-increasing demands for research assistance on complex problems involving the welfare and survival of our country.

Congress improved its staffing by the 1946 act. Within the Legislative Reference Service research specialists were employed so that Members and committees would have the same caliber of research and analysis available to the executive branch. It was recognized that Congress needed objective, unbiased research reports from independent experts. As time went on, our problems seemed to grow more complex, both at home and abroad. And the workload of every office increased with the demand from our constituents for more information from the Government. The impact of this situation upon the Legislative Reference Service was studied by the Joint Committee on the Organization of the Congress with the result that new directives have been written and guidelines for the future have been spelled out in greater detail than in the past.

The Joint Committee has recommended that the Legislative Reference Service be called the Legislative Research Service so that the primary role and mission of the organization will be highlighted. A reference division was recommended to handle routine reference inquiries, and it is heartening to realize that the fiscal year 1967 appropriations will help in the implementation of this proposal. The idea was advanced that temporary consultants could be employed to augment the regular staff, and a recommendation was made whereby the Librarian and the Joint Committee on the Library could authorize the employment of specialists and senior specialists in subjects of concern to the Congress. It has also been considered desirable that the relationships between the Legislative Reference Service and the committees of Congress shall be increased. It must be remembered that when Legislative Reference Service research specialists work with the committee staffs when requested, the result is the development of more staff expertise for all the committee members of the House and Senate.

When I first came to Washington as a new Member of the House, I was happy to learn that Congress had established its own independent, unbiased research organization and that I could call upon the staff members to assist with my congressional workload. Through the years of my service in the House, I have found the Legislative Reference Service indispensable. The Legislative Reference Service has a great potentiality for developing an increasingly significant role in the legislative process, and I hope that the Congress will continue to support

and strengthen the role and mission of its own research organization.

WELCOME TO THE NEW YORK WORLD JOURNAL TRIBUNE

Mr. RYAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. RYAN. Mr. Speaker, out of the ashes of three of New York's great newspapers, a brand new newspaper has arisen. While I may not be the first to announce its birth, it seems appropriate to pronounce its promise.

At 10 a.m., Monday morning, the New York World Journal Tribune was born.

To New York newspaper readers, characteristics of the three newspapers which it replaces were evident at once. Jim Bishop and Bob Considine from the Journal American were on hand for the opening issue, where the general layout and bold headline style of the World Telegram and Sun gave the paper a familiar appearance. In addition, the paper was graced by Jimmy Breslin, Dick Schaap, Joseph Alsop, Art Buchwald, and Evans and Novak, and the immensely readable typeface of the Herald Tribune.

Of course, the leadoff editorial assured readers that the new paper is "not a layer cake of different flavors," but rather "has a savor all its own." Happily, the flavor of the Herald Tribune remains. Jimmy Breslin's description of his "Night at the New Met" was sprawled across the full width of the top of page 1, telling New York readers once again what the people of their own town are really like, how they talk and how they act.

Splashed across the bottom of page 1, Dick Schaap told his townfolk "What Happened in Fun City?" in a characteristically irreverent and witty account of the activities of the city's new mayor.

With men like Breslin, Schaap, and Victor Riesel up front, and fellows like Art Buchwald and Carl Rowan near the back, the World Journal Tribune promises to be provocative and amusing. The only question outstanding is whether it will be responsive to the needs of the great city it will serve. Will its reporters really dig for news; will its editorial stance be truly constructive? For now that New York has but four daily newspapers, the responsibility of each is immense.

In its lead editorial the paper promised that "we have no commitments to any party, group, or special interest." "In news and comment," it stated, "we intend to be vigorous without being self-righteous, aggressive without being offensive, alert without being cynical." If it is as good as its word, it will be good indeed.

So it is with pride and great expectation that I congratulate New York on the birth of its new newspaper, and the new paper on its delayed arrival.

Mr. Speaker, for the edification and amusement of my colleagues, I am in-

serting in the RECORD the first lead editorial of the World Journal Tribune, along with the stories by Jimmy Breslin and Dick Schaap, and an article describing the paper's debut. The articles, which all appear in the September 12 issue of the newspaper, follow:

[From the World Journal Tribune, Sept. 12, 1966]

VOL. 1, No. 1

The World Journal Tribune appears on the New York scene with the sincere hope that our public will be as happy to read us as we are to write for them.

This is a new newspaper. It combines the talents, the traditions and many of the features of three great publications. But it is not a layer cake of different flavors. It is a mixture in which the readers should be able to taste familiar ingredients, but which has a savor all its own. And we intend to make the whole greater than the sum of its parts.

As a new paper, we have no commitments to any party, group or special interest. The sole responsibility of the World Journal Tribune is to the community; the only person in a position to pass judgment upon us is the reader. We are a New York newspaper, which means that our prime concern is this city—and since New York is a global metropolis, our interests are world-wide.

As all of New York and most of the nation know, our initial publication was not achieved without great tribulation and loss. This is no occasion for discussing the strains of the past months. Everyone concerned with the World Journal Tribune, however, is grateful for the encouragement we have received from so many quarters, as well as for the practical help in ironing out the many difficulties that arose along the way. In particular, the newspaper, employers and employees alike, is grateful to Mayor Lindsay for naming David L. Cole as mediator in resolving labor-management problems, as well as for his personal intervention; to Mr. Cole and his associates for their patience and skill in promoting a settlement; to the representatives of labor for their determination to negotiate a fair settlement.

We know that the kind of paper we are determined to give New York cannot be achieved without overcoming further obstacles, nor without a great deal of hard work and sound thinking. These qualities we will make our utmost efforts to bring to the task. In news and comment, we intend to be vigorous without being self-righteous, aggressive without being offensive, alert without being cynical.

We hope you will enjoy and have confidence in the result.

[From the World Journal Tribune,
Sept. 12, 1966]

JIMMY BRESLIN'S NIGHT AT THE NEW MET

On Friday, with lighted fountains rising into the air on the plaza outside the glass doors and Chagalls sweeping up the walls from the thick red carpeted floors, the Metropolitan Opera House opens its new home in Lincoln Center. It is the first opening of an opera house in New York since 1883, and it is a national occasion.

With Mrs. Lyndon B. Johnson in the audience, the Met opening calls for insurmountable problems of dress. As of the weekend, only Mrs. C. V. Whitney was certain of what she'll have on her back. A silver lace dress from Sarmi. Beyond that, all of New York plans and waits for Friday. In a city where the only new things that seem to open are these lines of ugly, unimaginative bank buildings with their banners proclaiming their virtue and their compound interest, the opening of a building for the mind is worth any waiting.

The Metropolitan Opera, however, isn't waiting for the people. The Met actually

gave its first performance last night. It opened with a full dress rehearsal of Samuel Barber's version of "Antony and Cleopatra." The audience consisted of 2,000 construction workers who had built the new opera house and were invited without charge. There were no serious injuries.

A stone mason was in Mrs. C. V. Whitney's seat last night. And a group of carpenters came over from O'Boyle and Mulvihill's Bar and sat down in David Rockefeller's box like it was nothing. And six members of Painters Local 803, Danny LaMotta shop steward, sat in the parterre and discussed opera as they know it.

"We're workin' the other day," one of them was saying, "you know, gold leafin' the ceiling, and here's this big opera broad and I look down and I yell, Hey, how do you like it, baby? And you know what she said? She motioned something in Italian."

For nearly all of them, except for the contractors and the bosses who swept it as if they belonged, it was the first opera any of the working guys ever had seen. They liked it, liked it very much, although in spots it was tough. Tommy McLaughlin, Local 508 of the Ornamental Iron Workers Union, sat in the grand tier, with the whisky in him making him hot, and he tugged at his collar for awhile, then finally got up and tip-toed on the red carpet and went down to the big bar on the second floor.

There were several people around. There was Mike Yuhase, a carpenter who had on a green sweater, and Ben Israel, who came with his tie pulled down, and Billy Casey, an iron worker who lives on 108th Street in Rockaway Beach and Tommy Raddish an asbestos worker who lived over McGovern's Bar in Richmond Hill, Queens.

"She sings beautiful, but I need a drink," Tommy McLaughlin said by way of complimenting Leontyne Price, who was in on the stage.

"Give me a shot of rye and a bottle of beer," McLaughlin told the bartender.

Behind the bar, a 30 by 36 foot Chagall, filled with reds and yellows covered the wall. On the white woodwork at one end of the bar was the hand printing, in blue, "Marc Chagall 1966." On Friday night, this will be a most admired sight. Last night, Tommy McLaughlin preferred to forget it.

"The day I saw it there for the first time, I went out after work and I meet some guy and I was telling him about it and he seemed to know something about art and we got along pretty good and then, by the time I got finished, I was in the Club Harlem in Atlantic City and when I went to get cigarettes I got busted out of my money on the bar. All Chagall reminds me of is sitting in the Western Union office waiting for a money order."

The people who stayed in their seats appreciated the opera very much. It started almost 40 minutes late and the performance was not nearly complete because the production simply was not ready. But librettist Franco Zeffirelli's work was awesome and Leontyne Price can sing like hell and the story of Antony and Cleopatra, of which we all know what they did, can't get printed in a newspaper, it is that good. The construction workers liked the opera very much.

They joined a select group. For yesterday, all the great opera people of New York, the people they don't tell you about in those society stories you get gagged with, turned out. There were the people lined up for the 200 standing room tickets which went on sale at noon. They had been on line since Wednesday, sleeping on the ground and wearing buttons for their favorite singers. One of them, Harry Philip, 63, has been waiting on lines like this since he saw Aida in 1919.

And at night, giving the new building the once over, was Mendel the great opera gate crasher, who is called Senator Mendel by everybody because he always used to sit in

the old Senator Cafeteria on 96th Street. Mendel lives on \$2,000 a year and he divides his time between New York and Vienna. He is able to do this because he knows how to make a dollar breathe. The minute Mendel gets into any house he takes off his suit and goes around in his underwear so he doesn't wear out the suit by sitting in it.

Mendel has been going to the opera, and not paying for it, since 1939. "Let the Vanderbilts support opera, Senator Mendel supports himself," Mendel said last night. "But I bring something to the opera when I come in. I bring a standard. Taste. What do these others bring? They bring their good suits. For that, they should be penalized money. Senator Mendel, you could put a gun in his ear, he wouldn't pay you money."

He is the best or thereabouts of the crowd of opera gate crashers which hung out in the bar and cafeteria near the 40th Street entrance to the old Met building. Mendel always brought his own sandwiches to the cafeteria and would sit there for hours, and knock the joint dead on water. Once, after much badgering, he bought a cup of coffee. The check was 15 cents.

"How long has it been this?" Senator Mendel yelled.

"For two years," the counterman said.

Last night, he gave the new Met a whirl. He positioned himself on the edge of a cluster of people coming in with their special tickets for the night, then with his hair flying he pushed into two big guys who looked like plasterers, slid off and went past the ticket taker, who had his head down.

So the night went, with Tommy McLaughlin drinking at the bar and Senator Mendel nodding to the music from a seat he got in the orchestra and the new Met, with its stage, 164 feet deep, and its chandeliers and its ivory and red and a gold leaf ceiling was a very good place to be in.

When it was over, the people in the opera said they had a lot of all night rehearsing to do to be ready for Friday, and some of the construction workers went across the street to O'Boyle and Mulvihill's and they played the juke box and kept saying the music seemed thin compared to what they had heard inside.

And we left them and came down for the first time to the World Journal Tribune newspaper to write a story. The editorial offices of the World Journal Tribune newspaper share the sixth floor of the building with a company called the Feedrail Corporation. The Feedrail Corporation manufactures third rails for railroad trains. This is very good because if this paper isn't good every day the boss can go next door and stick out his tongue onto a third rail.

[From the World Journal Tribune, Sept. 12, 1966]

DICK SCHAAP: WHAT HAPPENED IN FUN CITY?

Just the other day, the mayor of Fun City, John V. Lindsay, climbed onto a railing of the Manhattan Bridge, looked out upon the East River and prepared to dive. It's wonderful to have a mayor who is responsive to criticism.

Actually, the mayor did not have a bad summer, compared to, say, Sukarno, or Verwoerd. He kept the subways running. He kept the cross-streets free of snow. And he established his own personal style. He indicated that if he is elected president, he will send the Gallos to Viet Nam.

There is even some sign that the Lindsay administration is starting to reverse the flight of the white middle class to the suburbs. Already, Joe Bananas has moved back to New York. Mr. Bananas' flight from the city lasted 19 months, for reasons of health; he is allergic to trials.

Perhaps the mayor's noblest hour was his confrontation with the king of Saudi Arabia.

King Faisal was supposed to be the guest of honor at an official Fun City banquet, but just before the feast, the king, speaking in Washington, rashly let slip the fact that the Jews were his enemies.

This shocking news certainly upset Mayor Lindsay. If he had even suspected that the king of Saudi Arabia disliked Jews, he would never have invited him in the first place. The mayor boldly canceled the scheduled meal. It must have taken tremendous courage, but the mayor was willing to risk alienating the Arab community of New York. And it was only coincidence, I'm certain, that the following day all the offices at City Hall had Roman numerals on their door.

Lindsay fared less successfully in his bout with the Veterans of Foreign Wars. During their annual convention, the VFW staged a moonlight parade up Fifth Ave., and the parade stretched out until midnight, disturbing the sleep of several people who happen to live along Fifth Ave. The sleepless complained to the city, and the mayor apologized to them, infuriating the members of the VFW. They had fought to make the world safe for moonlight parades, and anyone who complained about losing a little sleep was clearly a Communist. Anybody who apologized to Communists was even worse. The mayor promptly promised to salute the flag regularly, and all was forgiven.

The mayor's most serious problem during the past four and a half months—if you forget about his full tax program, as he did, and about his civilian review board, as he may have to—was that some people got the impression he had surrendered his office to his commissioner of parks. I can't understand how people got this idea. Thomas P. F. Hoving is a bashful man, and the rumors are unkind that his middle initials stand for Publicity Forever.

Hoving does not go seeking attention. He rides a motorcycle through town only for the sake of convenience. He holds happenings in Central Park only for the sake of art. He leads hikes through Van Cortlandt Park only for the sake of exercise. And he holds hourly press conferences only for the sake of working newspapermen. He is a thoroughly self-effacing man, always working, always thinking. For instance, ever since Mayor Lindsay said that he sends his children to a private school for privacy, Hoving has been thinking about transferring his daughter to a public school.

No one resents the publicity Hoving has been getting. No one is jealous. Charles Moerdler, the buildings commissioner, goes around praying for the first cold wave, which would drive tenants out of their homes and out of the parks and into his office, but he's probably only kidding. Bud Palmer stood outside the World Journal Tribune yesterday welcoming reporters back to work, but, after all, he is the city's official greeter. And I don't think Bob Price really wanted David Merrick to change the title of the new musical, "Breakfast at Tiffany's" just because Hoving's father happens to own Tiffany.

Of course, the mayor did manage to get a fair share of attention from the press. During the first annual softball game between City Hall ("Lindsay's Lancers") and the City Hall reporters ("The Power Brokers"), the game was delayed for only 15 or 20 minutes while the mayor posed for pictures putting his jersey on.

After this dramatic scene, the game itself was anti-climactic. The mayor came to bat only once, and I was pitching, poorly, for the opposing team. My first pitch came in low and inside, near the mayor's knees, and Lindsay skipped neatly out of the way. Right then, I was deeply grateful that John Lindsay had won the mayoral race. The pitch would have hit Abe Beame in the head.

But the mayor's most spectacular appearance this summer came on the "Tonight" show. John Lindsay and Johnny Carson

traded jokes, and the mayor was particularly funny talking about muggings in Fun City. He probably has better mugging jokes than anyone else around.

Some of the mayor's constituents did not think it was right for the mayor to be kidding about muggings on network television. A few of the unhappy people wrote letters to City Hall, complaining that such antics were beneath the dignity of the mayor. The complaints are totally unfair; I must defend the mayor. Mugging jokes are certainly not beneath his dignity.

[From the World Journal Tribune, Sept. 12, 1966]

WJT'S DEBUT MAKES NEWS ACROSS NATION

The new World Journal Tribune greeted New York this morning with 80 pages of news, columns and features—and one important story that took shape almost without warning.

The normally hectic hours before the first edition became more feverish as the editors learned that the appearance of the new afternoon newspaper was itself making front page news across the nation.

The first indication came when a flood of telegrams and other messages expressing congratulations and best wishes from government and civic leaders began to arrive at the paper's headquarters at 125 Barclay St.

Then a steady stream of visiting newsmen almost took over the sixth-floor city room as reporters, news magazine writers, photographers and television crews recorded a history-in-the-making story—the birth of a major metropolitan newspaper.

As World Journal Tribune reporters and editors assembled the news for the first edition they found themselves being interviewed on the problems, excitement and emotions involved in their work. At the same time photographers were asking for "one more shot," and the television people did their best to turn the city room into a studio.

MAYOR STARTS PRESSES

These activities reached a climax this morning when Mayor John V. Lindsay pressed a button for the first press run of the World Journal Tribune. A press run of 900,000 copies was set for the first day.

Expressing his "delight" over the publication and the end of "a long and difficult dispute," Mayor Lindsay said:

"It is my hope and expectation that the World Journal Tribune will carry on the distinguished traditions from which it was born. . . . I am sure the new paper will make a major contribution to the life of our great city."

Watching the ceremony were Frank Conniff, editor of the paper; David L. Cole, who served as mediator during the long negotiations, and Matt Meyer, president and general manager of World Journal Tribune, Inc.

Meyer said: "We have come through almost five months of travail unprecedented in the newspaper history of this city, but it has been worth it because we are bringing out a paper to which we and all New York can point with pride."

LAST SNAG REMOVED

James J. McMahon, president of the New York Stereotypers Union No. 3, also reacted to the spirit yesterday in announcing that his union had overwhelmingly ratified a contract with the paper—thus removing the last obstacle to publishing the first edition.

"My feelings are perhaps best expressed," he said, "in the words of the lyrics of that popular song, 'Hello, Dolly.' So, to the World Journal Tribune, I say, 'Glad to see you back where you belong.'"

Thus ended the 140-day shutdown, the longest for a daily newspaper in the history of American journalism. It began April 24 when the Newspaper Guild went out against the publishing enterprise formed through

the merger of the Herald Tribune, World-Telegram and Sun and the Journal-American. Settlements eventually were reached with all 10 unions involved in the dispute.

The original plan called for an afternoon paper—World Journal; a morning paper—the Herald Tribune, and a Sunday paper—World Journal Tribune. But on Aug. 15, the corporation announced that due to economic and other pressures the morning paper would not publish.

World Journal Tribune will publish six afternoons a week and on Sunday.

ANTI-RIOT LEGISLATION

Mr. MINSHALL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio?

There was no objection.

Mr. MINSHALL. Mr. Speaker, the right to discuss, dissent, and demonstrate is not the right to plunder, pilfer, and destroy.

This House recognized that fact in decisive terms when we voted 389 to 25 on August 9 to add the Cramer anti-riot amendment to the civil rights bill. It is apparent that this legislation will not be passed by the Senate and in view of this fact it is urgent that the Congress take prompt action to protect our citizens against further violence and bloodshed.

And violence and bloodshed are being openly preached by such militant extremists as Stokely Carmichael. Just last month he said:

In Cleveland they're building stores with no windows—all brick. I don't know what they think they'll accomplish. It just means we have to move from Molotov cocktails to dynamite.

In city after city Stokely Carmichael and others of his ilk have proven that they will carry through with their threats of Molotov cocktails and dynamite.

I warned on this floor a month ago that our major cities would experience a bloodbath unless Congress takes stern action. Since that time riots have occurred in New York; Mississippi; Lansing, Detroit, Muskegon, and Benton Harbor, Mich.; Cicero, and Waukegan, Ill.; Dayton, Ohio; Atlanta, Ga., and right here in the Nation's Capital. There continue to be ugly and ominous incidents in my home city of Cleveland, Ohio, following in the wake of the massive riot in the Hough area in July.

Only today the Cleveland Press carries stories of new acts of depredation there. Last night vandals armed with fire bombs damaged and looted two stores in the Glenville area of the city.

In the Hough section two firemen were showered with flying glass while responding to one of a number of false alarms turned in last night. Their new \$16,000 firetruck was damaged. The incident occurred in the neighborhood of the Jomo Freedom Kenyatta House, which figured so prominently in the July Hough riots.

Cleveland police detectives are today trying to build evidence linking seven members of a new black power organization to vandalism which occurred last week in one of Cleveland's showplaces, the Cultural Gardens, which was observing its 50th anniversary. Statues were smeared with black paint and the words "black power" were painted on sidewalks and statuary. Cleveland detectives have revealed that headquarters of the United Black Brothers, frequented by the suspects, contained gasoline, black power literature and flags.

Accordingly I am today introducing legislation identical to Congressman Cramer's H.R. 17642, to make it a Federal offense to travel in or use a facility of interstate commerce with the intent of inciting a riot or other form of violent civil disobedience. I am doing so to indicate my strong support of such a law and my emphatic conviction that Congress will be remiss if we adjourn without acting to protect the lives and property of our citizens.

The need for this legislation is unquestioned. It is urgent. I respectfully call on the distinguished chairman of the House Committee on the Judiciary to heed the will of the citizens of this Nation and of the House by responding promptly to meet the need.

Mr. SIKES. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MINSHALL. I yield to the gentleman from Florida.

Mr. SIKES. Mr. Speaker, I want to associate myself with the comments which the gentleman has just made. I think it extremely important that anti-riot legislation be passed by the Congress now in session prior to adjournment.

I am proud of the fact that my distinguished colleague, the gentleman from Florida [Mr. Cramer], who sits on the other side of the aisle, is the senior author of this resolution. I, too, expect to introduce it.

Mr. MINSHALL. I should like to point out to my good friend from Florida that only today the Cleveland newspapers have reported another incident, with two acts of vandalism. Fire bombs damaged, and there were looted, two stores in the Glenville area of the city of Cleveland.

PRESIDENT JOHNSON ISSUES POLICY DECLARATION STRESSING NECESSITY FOR MASSIVE EFFORT TO STRENGTHEN SMALLTOWN AND RURAL AMERICA

Mr. EVINS of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Tennessee?

There was no objection.

Mr. EVINS of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, I am gratified and pleased that President Johnson made a major policy declaration to the effect that the solution to our national problems must include a concentrated, national program of economic development in smalltown and rural America.

I congratulate the President—and I say: Let us get on with it.

Much has been done, as the President pointed out in his speech in Dalls-town, Pa., last September 3. But, the real challenge lies ahead. Much remains to be done, and the acceptance of this great challenge as a national policy is a milestone in the growth and progress of smalltown and rural America.

I certainly pledge my continued support to the President in this great effort.

I am delighted that the President is advocating the thesis that a broader based economic development and the creation of opportunity in smalltown America constitute a major assault on the problems of both urban and rural smalltown America.

The President in his address outlined a concept and a philosophy that go to the heart of the problems that beset our Nation today in both urban and rural areas.

It has been my contention for years that the community concept found in smalltown America is the backbone of our democratic society.

It is this basic concept that must be nurtured and cultivated and encouraged throughout America—because it is the weakening of this concept, this ideal of mutual responsibility and identification with community, that has led to such tremendous problems in our cities.

It has also been my contention that the direct assault on the problems of our cities will founder unless there is a second front assault made to divert population growth from our cities. This can only be done by a national campaign to sell smalltown America—and a massive effort to create opportunities in smalltown rural America away from the great metropolitan complexes.

In this connection I wrote President Johnson on August 23, 1965, proposing "a concentrated effort to strengthen the smalltown base of America, to bring industry and business to small towns, to create towns that embody the best of the new technology and the best of the old philosophy."

The Honorable Lawrence F. O'Brien, now Postmaster General and then special assistant to the President, advised me as follows:

The outline of your proposal will have the careful consideration of the President and his advisers.

Because of the interest in this matter on the part of my colleagues and to the Nation generally, I include the letter to President Johnson in the RECORD. I also include in the RECORD excerpts from President Johnson's recent speech in Dalls-town, Pa.; a column which appeared in the Nashville Tennessean on May 16, 1965; an editorial which appeared today in the Washington Post; and the April 25, 1966, issue of Capitol Comments, my newsletter, which discusses the application of this concept of decentralization to Tennessee and to the great Fourth Congressional District of Tennessee, which I am honored to represent in the Congress.

These materials follow:

JULY 27, 1965.

HON. LYNDON B. JOHNSON,
The President,
The White House,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. PRESIDENT: I read with great interest recently a speech given by Richard N. Goodwin, one of your special assistants, to visiting foreign students. Mr. Goodwin observed at one point in the speech that "we have cleared the boards of most of the old ideas." He suggested a need for new ideas, new departures to meet the massive problems of our age.

I would like to propose a new concept which, if accepted and implemented, would attack many of our social and economic problems from a new direction in a new dimension. My suggestion basically is that rather than continuing to encourage urban growth we shift emphasis and encourage a national small town improvement and development campaign.

The proposal is this:

1. Large metropolitan complexes are becoming unmanageable, unwieldy and ungovernable. They have far exceeded the cities' ability to provide adequate services. They are not single entities; they are conglomerations of unrelated communities that have grown like toadstools. They breed slums, poverty, violence, suicide, discord, unhappiness. Cities have simply outgrown their original concept and their governments. They have exceeded in population and size the quantitative areas that can be governed effectively.

2. The community concept with all of its corollaries is basic to our American system. It is an effective unit. It embraces the psychological dimension that is missing in cities—the dimension of belonging, of being a part of a community, of being neighborly, of identifying with local government, of feeling significant.

3. This concept has been eroded as populations have migrated to our urban areas. Urban populations have been called "the lonely crowd." There is no identification, no feeling of belonging. There is distrust, lack of concern and compassion, lack of identification. Basic human values erode.

As you said in a speech on February 22 last, Mr. President, "The old, tried values of family and neighborhood and community are imperiled or eroded."

4. There are efforts to build whole new communities to retain the community concept and respect inherent in our forefathers' philosophy. But these are isolated efforts. What is needed is a concentrated effort to strengthen the small town base of America, to bring industry and business to small towns, to create towns that embody the best of the new technology and the best of the old philosophy.

5. I believe that people move to cities basically because that is where the greatest economic opportunities are found. You can see departures from this trend in small towns with progressive industry. The children think of staying, rather than leaving. And families who have lived in rural and small town areas prefer to move to a similar environment—but with greater opportunity to live the good life.

Your magnificent effort to build the Great Society is developing the nation in urban areas, rural areas and smaller communities. The new thrust that is needed—the new concept I suggest is a concentrated effort to develop the small town to its peak of perfection and to wage a national campaign to "sell" the small town to our new generation. This would ease urban problems by shifting growth to manageable divisions away from urban complexes.

The true values of our society are strongest in our small towns. We need to

strengthen our society by inducing our younger people to live within the strong town structure and concept.

I will be glad to discuss this matter with you at your convenience.

With highest esteem and best regards, I am,

Sincerely your friend,

JOE L. EVINS,
Member of Congress.

EXCERPT FROM SPEECH BY PRESIDENT JOHNSON IN DALLASTOWN, PA., SEPTEMBER 3, 1966

A few months ago, one of the polltakers went out across the country asking this question:

"If you could live anywhere in the United States that you wanted to, would you prefer a city, a suburban area, a small town, or a farm?"

Half of those polled said they preferred the small town or the farm.

I didn't get asked any questions in that poll, but you know where my vote would have been.

What does this mean at a time when more and more Americans are moving to our big cities?

It means that millions of Americans feel deprived of a fundamental human right: the right to live where they choose.

History records a long, hard struggle to establish man's right to go where he pleases and to live where he chooses. It took many centuries and many bloody revolutions to break the chains that bound him to a particular plot of land, or confined him within the walls of a particular community.

We lose that freedom when our children are obliged to live someplace else, that is, if they want a job or if they want a decent education.

Not just sentiment demands that we do more to help our farms and rural communities.

I think the welfare of this Nation demands it. And strange as it may seem, I think the future of the cities of America demands it, too.

One of the greatest tasks facing our generation is to rebuild the American city. That is why last year—more than 100 years after Abraham Lincoln created the Department of Agriculture—we created the Department of Housing and Urban Development.

I am proud that those who live in cities achieved the recognition that was long due them.

President John F. Kennedy started the fight to create a Department of Housing and Urban Development. I carried on that fight. And I am glad the Congress successfully passed our bill and it is now a fact.

I am concerned about the 50 million Americans who still live in communities of less than 50,000. The cities will never solve their problems unless we solve the problems of the towns and the smaller areas.

So consider the problem of urban growth. If the present trend continues, by 1985 as many people will be crowded into our cities as occupy the entire Nation today—in 1960. That means people enough to make five more New Yorks, or that means people enough to make 25 more Washingtons.

Many will migrate to the cities against their will, if we continue to allow this to happen.

But should we or must we allow this to happen? Must we export our youth to the cities faster than we export our crops and our livestock to the market?

I believe that we can do something about this.

I believe with your help we can change this trend of going from the rural towns, and the small town, to the cities.

To begin with, I think we can set a higher goal than parity for farm prices. We

want to achieve full parity for all rural life in all places in this country.

Today, a rural worker earns less for his day's work than a city worker with similar skills. And that is one reason why you have a labor shortage here in your own county.

Today, a high school or college graduate sees a bigger future for himself always in a major city. That is why too many of your sons and daughters move to Philadelphia or to Atlantic City or to New York.

That same story is being repeated all over America.

But I don't think it has to happen.

Modern industry and modern technology and modern transportation can bring jobs to the countryside rather than people to the cities.

And modern government could also help. I want to see more factories located in rural regions.

I want more workers able to supplement their incomes by part-time farming and more farmers working part-time in industry.

I want those who love the land to reap all the benefits of modern living.

And we are working to make this happen.

More than half of all the families who have benefited from our public housing and urban renewal programs now live in communities of less than 50,000 people.

Ninety-five out of every 100 urban planning grants go to communities under 50,000.

Four out of five of the communities receiving public housing grants now have populations under 25,000.

Ninety-seven out of every 100 public facility loans to help build libraries and water systems have gone to communities with fewer than 25,000 people.

I went to New England week before last to dedicate one of the first rural water systems under new legislation that we have just passed under the guidance of Senator GEORGE ARKEN, the dean of the Republican Party in the Senate, and under Congressman BOB POAGE, from my State.

So we need these thriving, healthy, rural areas, and we need thriving, healthy cities. But does it really make sense on this great continent which God has blessed, to have more than 70 percent of our people crammed onto 1 percent of our land?

We must rebuild our cities into better places to live, but we must clean out the slums, and we must end the crime, and we must clear the polluted air. We must give these children their parks and their playgrounds. But we must do much more than that.

We must make better use of the 99 percent of this continent which lies outside of the big cities of America.

We must ask more from and we must give more to communities like your own. For you have resources that no man can manufacture. You have space, you have room to breathe, you have an extra dimension of time.

In our great cities, men travel an hour to get to work. In towns like yours, they can get there in minutes.

We have major programs to promote high-speed urban transportation. But the same \$4 million which produces one mile of a thoroughfare in a city can create more than five miles of freeway in the countryside.

By the year 2000—and that is only a third of a century away—there will be 130 million more Americans here on this earth than there are today. We grow at a rate of more than 6,000 new Americans every day.

Each day, by our deeds, we shape the quality of life for these children and for their children's children.

Each day, by the example we set, we are helping to shape the lives of hundreds of millions of people throughout the world.

For this migration away from farms and countryside is universal—bringing heavy burdens to men and women in a hundred different lands.

So if we can begin to stem the migration in our own land, we will make our mark on history.

I believe that we have the brains and the will and the imagination to make our mark. I believe that more and more of our people will choose to live in towns like Dallastown.

I know they would, if they could come here and see what I am looking at this afternoon.

I hope by my deeds as your President I will help to bring this about and help to make this possible for them. Because, indeed, I know in the end what I said in the beginning, that this is where the girls are fonder and the dinner pails are fuller.

Thank you.

NOTE: The President spoke at 2:45 p.m. at Dallastown, Pa.

[From the Washington (D.C.) Post,
Sept. 14, 1966]

THE URBAN CRISIS

Delegates to the conference on Urban America, just concluded here this week, had a great deal to say about the social, political, economic and psychological consequences of the increasing concentration of population in urban centers. Most of the delegates seemed to accept as inevitable, as the Vice President did in his speech, the continued movement of America toward a metropolitan society.

Given the difficulties of coping with congested urban populations already in the great cities, it is remarkable that so little attention was paid to the possibility of arresting the emigration into the cities.

This is the more puzzling in view of President Johnson's eloquent address at Dallastown, Pennsylvania, on September 2. The President told his audience there that if present trends continue, the population of the cities of more than 50,000 by 1985 will exceed the total national population of 1960. And he asked a question that did not seem to occur to the conference delegates. "Does it really make sense," the President inquired, "to have 70 per cent of our people crammed onto one per cent of the land?"

Acknowledging the need to improve the cities, the President told his rural audience "we must make better use of the 99 per cent of this continent which lies outside of the cities."

"The migration away from farms and countryside," the President said, "is universal—bringing heavy burdens to men and women in a hundred different lands." He appealed for an effort to stem this migration. He suggested that if the country provided "full parity for rural life in America" more and more people "will choose to live in towns like Dallastown." And he ended his Dallastown address on a note the sincerity of which no one can doubt. He said: "I hope by my deeds as President to help make this possible for them."

The burden of the President's speech was that the continued migration to the cities "doesn't have to happen"; but the impression of the Urban America conference is that this trek from the countryside is inevitable and inescapable.

As the intractability of many urban problems becomes more and more evident, the necessity of preventing the aggravation of the existing crisis becomes more and more apparent. Other nations parallel our experience with these urban difficulties. Moscow is moving 400 industries out of the area inside its central highway loop, in an effort to cope with some of the problems of congestion.

For more than a century the big cities have struggled to become bigger. They have attracted into their crowded neighborhoods more and more people; but they have not devoted more and more effort to making life in the cities endurable. The urban aspiration now ought to be to make the cities smaller. And the national purpose ought to

be to make rural life, in the small cities, towns, villages and farm areas, sufficiently attractive to retain more rural population where it is.

[From the Nashville (Tenn.) Tennessean,
May 16, 1965]

REPRESENTATIVE EVINS PITCHES FOR SMALL TOWNS

(By Lois Laycock)

WASHINGTON.—Rep. JOE L. EVINS is emerging as the congressional champion of the small town which he calls "the forgotten part of America."

From his position as a high ranking member of the House Appropriations committee and as chairman of the House Small Business committee, EVINS has been hammering home to government agency witnesses the theme that "the small town is the backbone of America."

He has charged that too many federal programs ignore the small towns but have their emphasis on urban areas. He has suggested that these programs be expanded from their urban orientation to include broader standards to benefit smaller communities.

This crusade comes naturally to EVINS who is from Smithville, Tenn. (pop. 2,000) and from a district that contains about 100 small towns, many more smaller unincorporated communities—and no big cities.

In recent hearings before the Appropriations committee when officials of the Tennessee Valley Authority appeared in behalf of their budget requests, EVINS, who was presiding, took the TVA officials to task for what he said was their refusal to give smaller towns the right to distribute TVA power.

HIGH TIME

"I think it is high time that you and other officials of government recognize the importance of the small town which has become the forgotten part of America," EVINS said heatedly. "Everything seems to be urban-oriented now—government programs, government planning, legislation, articles in magazines, discussions on radio and television. Everyone is concerned with the urban problem—and I have no argument with this concern because there is a tremendous problem due simply to the fact that our metropolitan complexes have grown so big the basic purposes of a city have become self-defeating . . .

"It is my contention that the small town is still a vital factor in the life of this nation, that there should be a national effort to encourage a buildup of small towns to capture the best of the old—the community spirit and pride—and the best of the new. And by the new I mean modern industry and modern conveniences and well-rounded economies. We must build the economies and opportunities of our small towns. This will help hold our talented young people there."

At another hearing on appropriations for independent agencies, EVINS jumped Veterans Affairs Administrator William Driver for what the congressman said was an effort to move VA hospitals out of small towns to big cities.

EVINS said the VA had shifted from a policy that included hospitals in smaller communities to a new policy limiting them to larger cities. Driver denied this was VA's policy but failed to convince the Fourth District congressman.

STAUNCH SUPPORTER

Still later, while presiding over the House Small Business committee, EVINS questioned whether the administration's war on poverty program is reaching small towns and rural areas. He asked Small Business Administrator Eugene P. Foley, who was testifying before the committee, to make certain that the SBA phase of the program be made available to small towns as well as to urban areas.

EVINS has been a staunch supporter of the SBA's community development program which has made many of its loans to small towns where local citizens have organized development corporations.

EVINS has served notice on other government witnesses that he intends to wage a more determined campaign to see that small towns are not forgotten in various government programs.

ANNOUNCEMENT OF FIFTH DOUGLAS PLANT FOR OUR DISTRICT POINTS TO NEW ERA OF SMALL TOWN GROWTH AND PROGRESS

(Capitol Comments by JOE L. EVINS, Member of Congress, Fourth District, Tennessee)

The announcement of the decision by officials of the Douglas Aircraft Industry of California to locate a fifth plant in our area—the great Fourth Congressional District of Tennessee—underscores an encouraging trend of economic development in Appalachia and in other sections of rural and small-town America.

Colonel Wellwood E. Beall, Executive Vice President of Operations at Douglas, announced recently that Douglas would locate its fifth plant in Tennessee at Smithville. The announcement was made at Sparta at a banquet following dedication of a Douglas plant there. Others are being built and currently are in operation at Monterey, Carthage and Gainesboro.

Douglas is locating these manufacturing plants in our area in line with the President's recommendation for a broader based economic development which he—and Douglas officials—consider essential if this country is to make appreciable progress in solution of both rural and urban problems.

As Colonel Beall said during the Sparta dedication, "What is needed is a reversal of the national trend toward urbanization. What is needed is an effort that will halt the drain of workers and youth from the nation's small communities to urban areas, an effort that instead will take opportunity to these small communities and provide them with the economic ability upon which they can thrive."

Colonel Beall also said this decentralization of industry will "enhance the cornerstone of our democracy, the American small town." This is most gratifying and most encouraging. This is a theme that your Representative has emphasized over a period of years.

In May of 1965, for example, during hearings of the Public Works Appropriations Subcommittee, I made this statement:

"There should be a national effort to encourage a buildup of small towns to capture the best of the old—the community spirit and pride—and the best of the new. And by the new I mean modern industry and modern convenience and well-rounded economies."

In a letter to President Johnson last July this approach was reiterated as I urged advocacy of programs for development of small-town and rural America.

Secretary of Agriculture Orville Freeman is preaching this gospel from coast to coast. Both Douglas Aircraft, which has located five plants in our district, and Lockheed—which is locating a plant in Shelbyville—subscribe to this theory of industrial decentralization. The growth acceptance of this concept points to a new era of growth for small towns and to new progress in all America.

"WHAT THE COMPUTER MEANS TO LAW"—ADDRESS BY CHARLES S. RHYNE

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Florida?

There was no objection.

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. Speaker, we are all aware of the great contribution which is being made to the cause of peace, as well as to the establishment of law and order in the world, by the great organization, the World Peace Through Law Center, of which the Honorable Charles S. Rhyne is the initial advocate and the distinguished president.

Mr. Rhyne has just returned from Europe where he met with leaders of the bar to promote the high aims of this meaningful organization. In the course of his trip, Mr. Rhyne delivered a significant address to the Center's planning committee on July 16, in Geneva, Switzerland.

I include Mr. Rhyne's letter to me upon his return, and his magnificent address, in the body of the RECORD following my remarks, and I commend both to my colleagues and my fellow countrymen.

The material follows:

WORLD PEACE THROUGH LAW CENTER,
Washington, D.C., July 19, 1966.

HON. CLAUDE PEPPER,
Congress of the United States,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR CLAUDE: I have just returned from Europe where I had a series of meetings with leaders of the Bar ending with a meeting of our worldwide planning committee in Geneva, Saturday, July 16th. The main purpose of these meetings was to work on the feasibility of using a computer in Geneva to store digests of all statutory law of nations, all high court decisions, and all treaties of general application. This is a dramatic new development in line with the thoughts expressed in my North Dakota speech. I am most grateful to you for placing that speech in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD and for your kind words when you did.

I enclose herewith the copy of the address I made to the Center's Planning Committee on July 16 on computers and the law together with the attachment.

This really means that the lawyer in Asia, Latin America, and for that matter in the United States, who has only a few law books available to him will soon be able to secure from Geneva—for a very nominal fee or no fee if foundation support is adequate—law, treaties, and high court decisions. Since law cannot be used unless it is available, I sincerely believe this is a tremendous breakthrough which will have enormous impact throughout the world. It is not only private attorneys who do not have law available to them, but governments.

With much gratitude for your continued interest and assistance and assurance that we are really moving to make law a replacement for force as a controlling factor in the fate of humanity, I remain,

Sincerely,

CHARLES S. RHYNE.

WHAT THE COMPUTER MEANS TO LAW

(By Charles S. Rhyne, Washington, D.C., president, World Peace Through Law Center, presented to World Peace Through Law Planning Committee, July 16, 1966, John R. Mott House, Geneva, Switzerland)

The computer will soon achieve such universal use in law research as to revolutionize law. So vital is the computer to the mission of the World Peace Through Law Center that the Center is moving with all possible speed

to develop a computer capacity. This is the story of the Center's quest for that capacity.

Law is not used in many nations, or in the world community, as much as it should be largely because law materials are unavailable to those lawyers and government officials who could use it. Law, like a muscle, grows strong through use. The computer will revolutionize the whole field of law by making more law available to more lawyers and more usable by government officials in more nations and in international organizations.

Availability and usability through the computer can be the great "breakthrough" needed to make law grow through use until it is strong enough to replace force as the controlling factor among nations internationally.

Even when law material is available, no profession needs to search such a mass of voluminous material to secure the information needed to arrive at a correct decision as does the lawyer. We lawyers research and use, or we should, millions of court decisions, thousands of state and federal statutes, hundreds of city and county ordinances and thousands of federal administrative regulations, rulings and orders. In addition, there are legislative reports, law reviews, law books and other law materials. Because we are engulfed with this vast, ever-increasing mass of law materials there is no group, no profession, no endeavor which needs the help which computers can give more than we lawyers.

Most people seem to believe that all the law he needs is readily available to every lawyer, professor and government official. This idea is false.

The law material available to the vast majority of the world's 1,000,000 lawyers and many government officials is meager indeed. With a few exceptions law libraries are small and inaccessible to the average lawyer and most government officials. And they cannot use law unless it is available to them.

This fact began to dawn upon the World Peace Through Law Center as it began efforts to carry out the more than 200 projects contained in its Global Work Program. Lawyers are enthusiastically willing to help carry out this program if given the law materials with which to work. The task of providing these law materials is formidable indeed. Hence our growing interest in the computer and what it can do to meet this problem.

The Center recently published a survey of law and court systems in 110 nations. In its famous Work Paper the Center surveyed past and existing international law and legal institutions. Because so many lawyers reported that the law materials available to them were meager or almost non-existent the Center also did a survey of law libraries world-wide. Here the facts are startling as they illustrate the dearth of law available to most lawyers.

The United States has the largest law libraries. These are the Law Division of the Library of Congress which has 1,100,000 volumes and Harvard Law School with 1,080,000. Columbia Law School has 450,000; Los Angeles County Law Library, 440,000; and Michigan Law School, 350,000. Other law schools have from 300,000 down to a few thousand volumes. The largest New York law firm library has 41,000 volumes and a few have 10 to 30 thousand volumes. But most lawyers who practice in the United States have access in their home city—or county seat—to an average law library of 5 to 10 thousand volumes.

The law volumes in the largest law libraries around the world are as follows: Paris University, 390,000; The Japanese Law Ministry, 270,000; Russia's Academy of Science, 260,000; Italy's Ministry of Justice, 150,000; Portugal's Coimbra University, 150,000; Canada's Supreme Court, 130,000; Czechoslovakia's Comenius University, 120,000;

England's Oxford and Cambridge, 110,000 each; London's Lincoln Inn and Inner Temple, 100,000 each; Berlin's Kammergericht, 105,000; UN Peace Palace in Geneva, 100,000; University of Rome, 75,000; China's Soochow University, 50,000; Mexico's Institute of Comparative Law, 40,000; Helsinki Law School, 30,000; Philippine University, 25,000; and Turkey's Istanbul University, 20,000. Throughout the world these law volumes are not usually available to the entire legal profession of each nation as many lawyers live in far distant cities. In Latin America the average law library size per nation is around 10,000 volumes and in Africa, where Nigeria's largest law library is less than 5,000 volumes, there are nations with only a few hundred volumes or less.

The statutes of many nations remain largely uncodified and largely unavailable in up-to-date form. The study by James Hudson attached as Exhibit A makes this point clear. A similar study of the availability of the text of decisions of high courts of nations has not been completed but a preliminary report reveals their availability is even less than that of the statutes.

International law material in particular is not only difficult to locate but is largely without usable indexes. The UN Treaty Series and the League of Nations Treaty Service are incomplete and only a few law libraries have these. The Treaty Collections of Foreign Ministries of nations are limited usually to those treaties to which the particular nation belongs. While the United States belongs to over 1,400 treaties some nations belong to less than 20.

International law material is multiplying on a vast scale as the world operates more and more as an interdependent whole. But its collection or acquisition is difficult and some law libraries make no attempt to do so. Their acquisition money is still largely earmarked for domestic law.

The American Society of International Law publishes selected International Legal Materials. Lauterpacht's International Law Reports contain some of the national court decisions involving international law. The World Court's decisions are available in printed volumes. National legislation on international subjects, and customary international law, are largely not compiled except as some scholar collects material on some specialized subject. Foreign office archives, including diplomatic correspondence and foreign office law opinions, are rarely published and usually only some 20 years after the event to which addressed.

The International Law Library Association has begun publication of an Index to Foreign Legal Periodicals which is of enormous help but too few lawyers and too few law libraries subscribe to it. The Center is seeking some way to include this Index with its own publications which are sent to members worldwide.

As the Center assayed its task of strengthening and expanding law and courts worldwide it became apparent that a major barrier to this program was the general unavailability of law to lawyers, judges and professors of law. The Center began to query those who operate the great compilations of law, the law librarians. The law librarians confirmed the Center's findings on law library inadequacies but quickly made clear their desire to have the law books they do have used as widely as possible. They emphasized that their libraries exist to be useful. The law librarians suggested that they do something immediate by furnishing law information on request to any member of the Center. This offer was accepted at once and this law reference service is now in operation under the direction of Earl Borgeson, Law Librarian of Harvard, with the cooperation of the International Law Librarians Association. It is constantly growing in use and value.

The law librarians were quick to point out the promise and potential of making more law more available by using computers. The enthusiasm of librarians for this method and the facts they had compiled proved it a practical, in fact dramatic, solution to the problem. The compilation by William S. Rhyne in Exhibit B gives the status of computer use for law research in the United States. A query has gone out worldwide in an effort to discover what has been done about computer use in the field of law in other nations.

To meet the need which exists the Center must and will establish a capacity to gather, store, process, retrieve and distribute law materials on a world-wide basis. While the much appreciated service now rendered by law librarians is indeed wonderful the computer appears to furnish a more complete and speedier answer. The comments herein are based upon reports of experience and visits to computer projects to observe the computerization of law, medicine and other subjects.

While computers are expensive, it is clear from the outset that the major cost will be the gathering and indexing of the law material which is put into the computer. It is said that the basic cost of programming and preparation of the law "data bank" for the computer will cost 3 or 4 times more than the basic cost of the computer itself. The indexing must be done personally and manually by lawyers who abstract sufficient material to identify each court decision, statute, treaty or convention which material is then fed into the computer. The value of the index or digest in the computer depends upon the ability, training, knowledge, imagination and skill of the persons preparing this material. One can get out of a computer only that which is fed into it.

That the use of the computer for law research is already an accomplished fact is proved by the compilation in Exhibit B attached to this report. While successful experience is not yet extensive, it is a sufficient test to establish the computer's utility in law research. This limited experience will undoubtedly grow quickly as there are many not listed in Exhibit B who are working on the gathering and storage of law in computers.

To allay unfounded fears, it should be stated that the computer will never replace the trained legal mind but it can take some of the drudgery out of law research. The computer can do only what it is told to do. It is incapable of original thought or reasoning. The computer can search millions of cases, and enormous quantities of material, in a fraction of a second whereas the traditional manual law research method takes many hours or many days to perform the same function. And the computer by eliminating human error is much more comprehensive and precise in performing tedious but essential legal research.

Computerized information retrieval will thus save lawyers many hours of digging through case histories. The computer provision of instantaneous access to court precedents will bring a new dimension into law. Lawyers will not only have more material but they will have more time to study the materials thus provided and arrive at a judgment as to what course of action to follow.

As the compilation in Exhibit B reveals some have stored the full text of statutes and court decisions in computers. Others have stored digests of this material. The full text method is tremendously expensive as it requires the typing of the full text onto tapes. The tapes are then fed into computers. Sometimes the computer scans the tape but this means review of all tapes and could take considerable time. Sometimes the material on the tapes is stored directly in the computer and thus is instantly available

as in the LRS—Western Union "on line" system.

Work is under way on a method to put the full text of books into computers by a scanning or photographic reproduction method without retyping the text. This method is not yet perfected.

Just as lawyers must now be familiar with the traditional way of researching text books, law reviews, digests, codes and court decisions, so too must they learn to use the computer. This will not be very difficult as the computer is basically a very simple device. Lawyers have learned how to use a large number of specialized services each having a few peculiarities and computers will present very few user problems of greater magnitude.

It is true that new methods and new ideas are being developed for indexing legal materials so they may be stored and retrieved from computers. The physical materials used to store and retrieve data in a computer are punch cards and magnetic tape. Legal material such as court decisions are usually stored in a computer by manually abstracting or indexing their contents onto a card. An operator then puts this material into the computer and so programs the computer that it will automatically compile an index for user retrieval of the material.

So far computer indexers doing abstracts use a "point of law" system similar to West Publishing Company's key number system or a new system developed by the Graduate School of Public Law of George Washington University called "descriptors." Under the latter system the indexer culls from court decisions and puts on index cards facts, legal concepts, party names, judges' names, court jurisdictions, dates and other identifiable factors. This is a much more detailed index than the "point of law" index.

The Health Law Center of the University of Pittsburgh has developed an index system of assigning numbers to statutory sections and this index number is used to retrieve the section. Another system developed by the Southwestern Legal Foundation assigns numbers to all the meaningful words in the text of each court decision and uses those as an index to retrieve materials stored on computers.

There is nothing particularly new or novel in computer law indexes. Certain new terms are being used by computer operators. For example, the computer index is, with its retrieval number, called a Thesaurus. The legal profession will find it easy to find the number in the "Thesaurus" of the material or court decisions which will cause the computer to disgorge this material as desired.

The computer can be designed to perform a vast variety of functions including language translations. In order to utilize the computer as a translator it is necessary to provide it with necessary language data and instructions telling it what to do with that data. There is very little data on actual experience with computers for translations but experts assure that it is technically feasible.

Computers control Tokyo's traffic. New York will soon have a similar system. Stolen car and other license numbers are stored in computers which give an instant response to police. Most banks operate their bookkeeping via computers not only for speed but accuracy. Giant passenger airplanes are now landed via computer during foggy weather. The thousands of other things a computer can be and is used for are growing day by day. An idea can now be transmitted around the world in one-seventh of a second. Newspapers, radio and television do this constantly. Law can be transmitted just as readily.

We of the law must also modernize and update our way of performing our functions so as to take full advantage of electronic data processing of law materials. I have not the slightest doubt that we will do so and all

mankind will thereby be better served by both lawyers and the law.

The Center must be at the forefront of this "law" explosion.

The LRS computer is tied into Western Union's Telex system so that any lawyer in the United States can go to a Western Union office or have a Telex installed in his own office (for \$35.00 per month) and secure responses in seconds to requests for court decisions on any subject within the computer. Each request costs \$10.00. This same type of "instant" research is possible worldwide. The Center can feed decisions of high courts of nations into a computer in Geneva and any lawyer, judge, or government official can secure or retrieve this information via telegraph cable. It has been suggested that the full text of these decisions be stored via microfilm in 10 to 20 "banks" around the world from which copies could be obtained upon request. The same system could be followed for statutes of nations, treaties and other international legal material.

This use of computers to make more law more available is the wave of the future in law. The Center's study is aimed at speeding the arrival time of this wave. The Center will start a modest computer program and add to it as funds become available. The cost may appear to be prohibitive but with 1,000,000 lawyers in the world and many governments and multi-nation corporations desiring and helping to pay for this service this cost can be met by many paying a small amount each.

The Center will move slowly but steadily in creating its computer capacity. As recommended by its Committee under John Deere, the Center will rent all equipment and start very small. In the end it is hoped that the lawyer in Nepal, Nairobi, Caracas, Rio de Janeiro, Paris, New Delhi or Tokyo can have access to an "on-line" law computer just as the lawyers in many States now have such access through LRS—Western Union. What a shrinking of the world this will be. And what a "breakthrough" for an orderly world under law.

Since law can do more for world peace than all the bombs man can make and all the armies he can march the great imperative of our day is to create enough international law to replace bombs and armies.

Law cannot remain unaffected and apart from the processes of dramatic change of our epochal era. The miraculous social, economic and scientific advances of our day require that law keep pace. Use of the computer is a giant step toward this essential goal. As new advances are embodied in law they become permanent advances. This, too, advances world peace.

EXHIBIT A

MOST RECENT CODIFICATION OF LAWS IN VARIOUS COUNTRIES OF THE WORLD

(By James L. Hudson)

- Afghanistan: No compilation.
- Algeria: Juris-Classeur Algerien (maintained up to date through looseleaf supplements).
- Argentina: Anales de Legislacion Argentina, 1964 (latest general index 1954; yearly indexes are included in each volume).
- Austria: Das Österreichische Recht (maintained up to date through yearly supplements).
- Australia: Commonwealth Acts, 1965.
- Basutoland: Laws of Basutoland, 1959.
- Bechuanaland: Laws of Bechuanaland, 1959.
- Belgium: No codification, (yearly session laws).
- Bolivia: Disposiciones Legales, 1949.
- Brazil: Vademecum Forense, 1965.
- Burma: The Burma Code, 1934 (since 1943 the code has added new volumes but no codification).

Canada: Revised Statutes of Canada, 1952 (brought to date by yearly statutory table).
Ceylon: Legislative Enactments of Ceylon, 1956.

Chile: Recopilación de Leyes, 1966.
Costa Rica: Leyes y Reglamentos Usuales, 1944 (indexed to 1954).

Cuba: Legislación Cubana, 1958, Laws of the Revolution, 1964.

Cyprus: Laws of Cyprus, 1959.
Denmark: Karnow's Lousamling, 1960 (yearly supplements).

Ecuador: Constitution and Laws of Ecuador, 1961.

El Salvador: Recopilación de Leyes, 1955.
France: No general compilation (yearly session laws indexed).¹

Finland: Suomenkaki, 1965 (volume 1); Suomenkaki, 1964 (volume 2) (both volumes are replaced every two years).

Gambia: Laws of Gambia, 1965.
Germany: No general compilation.¹

Guyana: Laws of British Guinea, 1953.
Ghana: The Laws of the Gold Coast, 1951.

Honduras: Laws of British Honduras, 1958.
Hungary: Laws and Edicts in Force, 1964;

Cabinet Decrees and Resolutions in Force, 1964; Ministerial Decrees in Force, 1964.

Iceland: No compilation (latest bound official gazette, Stjornartidindi, 1962).

India: India Code, 1955 (maintained up to date by looseleaf supplements).

Iran: Majmu'at Qawanin wa-Mugarrarat Kushur (compilation of laws, regulations, maintained up to date with annual looseleaf supplements).

Iraq: al-Majmu'ah al-Da'imah lil-Qawanin wa-al-Anzimah al-'Iraqiyah al-muwahhadah, 1948 (compilation of Iraqi laws, regulations).

Ireland: No general compilation.
Italy: No general compilation.¹

Jamaica: Laws of Jamaica, 1953.
Japan: Iwanami's Six Codes (yearly supplements).

Jordan: Majmu'at al-Qawanin wa-al-Anzimah al-Sadriyah waal-nafidhat al-maf'ul li-Hayat Sanat 1956, Fi al-mamlakah al-Urduniyah al-Hashimiyah (compilation of Jordanian laws, regulations in force up to 1956; published in 3 vols. 1956-1961, but not maintained up to date).

Kenya: The Laws of Kenya (maintained up to date with looseleaf supplements).

Korea: Sokwan's, Six Codes (annual publication).

Kuwait: No compilation.

Lebanon: Maju'at al-Tashri' al-Lubonai (compilation of Lebanese legislative acts, published in 5 volumes and maintained up to date with looseleaf supplements).

Liberia: Liberian Code of Laws, 1956.

Libya: Mawsu'at al-Tahri'at al-Libiyah (Encyclopedic compilation of Libyan legislation, published in 10 volumes and maintained up to date with looseleaf supplements).

Liechtenstein: No compilation.¹
Luxembourg: No compilation.¹

Malawi: Laws of Nyasaland, 1957 (maintained up to date with looseleaf supplements).

Federated Malaya States: Laws of the Federated Malaya States, 1935 (supplemented by looseleaf up to 1961).

Malta: Laws of Malta, 1942.

Mexico: No general compilation.²
Monaco: Lois Usuelles, 1949.

Morocco: Les Codes Marocaine (maintained up to date by looseleaf supplements).

Nepal: No compilation.

Netherlands: Fruin, Nederlandsche, Wetboeken Uitgegeven Door, 1959, yearly supplements).

New Zealand: New Zealand Statutory Reprint, 1957.

Nigeria: Laws of the Federation of Nigeria and Lagos, 1958.

Norway: Norges Lover, 1682-1963 (replacements every 3 years).

Pakistan: Unrepealed Central Acts, 1952 (mostly Indian legislative acts).

Panama: Legislación Panamena, 1958.

Paraguay: No general compilation.

Peru: Compelacion de la legislación, 1956.

Poland: No general compilation.

Sierra Leone: Laws of Sierra Leone, 1960.

Singapore: Laws of the Colony of Singapore, 1955.

South Africa: The Union Statutes, Classified and Annotated Reprint, 1947.

Sudan: The Laws of Sudan, 1955.

Swaziland: The Laws of Swaziland, 1949.

Sweden: Sveriges Rikes Lag, 1966.

Switzerland: Bereinigte Sammlung Der Bundesgesetze und Verordnungen, 1848-1947 (check yearly session laws for revisions; more properly speaking the 15 volumes of this work would be called a general collection of laws instead of a compilation or codification).

Saudi Arabia: No compilation.

Syria: Majmu'at al-Tashri' al-Suri (Compilation of Syrian legislation, published in 9 volumes and maintained up to date by looseleaf supplements).

Tanzania: Tanganyika Revised Laws; The Laws of Zanzibar (both maintained up to date with looseleaf supplements).

Trinidad and Tobago: Laws of Trinidad and Tobago, 1950.

Tunisia: No compilation.

Turkey: No compilation.

Uganda: Revised Laws of Uganda, 1964.

United Arab Republic: (a) al-Mawsu'ah al-Misriyah lil-Tashri' wa-al-Qada'. (Encyclopedic compilation of Egyptian legislation and judicial decisions; five volumes and maintained up to date by looseleaf supplements.) (b) al-Mawsu'ah al-Tahri'iyah al-hodithah lil-Jamhuriyah al-Arabiyyah al-Mutahidat. (Modern encyclopedic compilation of the legislation of the U.A.R.; 26 volumes maintained up to date by looseleaf supplements.)

U.S.S.R.: No compilation.

United Kingdom: Halsbury's Statutes of England (yearly supplements).

Uruguay: Recopilacion de Leyes Vigentes del Uruguay, 1947.

Venezuela: Compilacion Legislativa de Venezuela, 1954.

Yugoslavia: No compilation.

Zambia: Laws of Zambia (maintained up to date with looseleaf replacements).

FRENCH SPEAKING AFRICA

In spite of substantial enactment of various types of legislation, none of the French speaking nations of Africa, South of Sahara, since independence has initiated any codification. As a matter of fact, in many fields of law the previous French or Belgian statute still applies, thus, the codification of Juris Classeur de la France d'Outre-Mer updated to 1960 is still the collection and codification of laws used by mentioned nations.³

The same may be said for their criminal legislation which, despite the existence of some newly enacted criminal codes, the codification of the Bouvenet's Droit Penal en Afrique, remains the main source of criminal law. An exception to this situation are only Cameroun (Codes et Lois du Cameroun), Malagasy (Les Codes Bleus Malgaches) and

³ Statements made by African jurists including the Chief of the Supreme Court of the Republic of Senegal.

the Republic of the Congo (Codes et Lois du Congo) where codification of laws began since French or Belgian rule and proceeds more or less in the same manner.

EXHIBIT B

LAW RESEARCH BY COMPUTER

(By William S. Rhyne)

This is a survey for the World Peace Through Law Center to identify each project—initiated or planned—making use of a computer for research in the field of law in the United States.

This survey is not intended to analyze or evaluate these projects but merely to describe them as background for a far-reaching Center program, whose ultimate purpose is to store legal information in computers for retrieval by Center members.

This is Part One of the Center's study on computer law research, and is limited to experience in the United States.

I. PROJECTS EMPLOYING MANUAL INDEXING

A. Law Research Service

Law Research Service of New York in cooperation with Western Union presently stores 3,000,000 federal and state case citations in a Univac 418 computer for instant on-line retrieval. From Law Research Service in New York, court case citations will be available under the following federal and state categories:

Federal—Admiralty and Law of the Sea, Anti-trust and Unfair Trade, Banking and Insurance, Bankruptcy, Constitutional Law and Public Authority, Contracts and Agency, Corporations and Securities, Criminal Law, Copyrights, Trademarks, and Patents, Family Law, Natural Resources, Negligence, Property, and Taxation.

State—Corporations, Contracts, and Business Law, Criminal Law, Domestic Relations, Estates and Wills, Evidence and Procedure, Negligency, Public Law and State Taxation, Real and Personal Property.

To use LRS, an attorney must purchase thesauri, or indexes, in whichever of the above-mentioned areas he desires, at \$75 each. He then finds the appropriate ten-digit number from the thesaurus and, on a personal model rented from Western Union or on that of the LRS area representative, he types the number onto a Telex teletypewriter, which provides immediate, on-line access to the Univac 418 computer in New York. Case citations are then automatically teletyped onto the Telex unit. Personal observation has shown this method to be both instantaneous and reliably accurate.

LRS will process four code numbers for \$10 plus a \$2 line charge. The Service also offers for \$20 a Special Evaluation whereby, from the fact situation as submitted by the attorney, LRS decides what areas are covered and then lists appropriate case citations. Printouts of the full texts of court decisions, taken from a microfilm file, are available at 4 court decisions for \$5.

B. Internal Revenue Service

The RIRA computer system supplies the 41 legal information centers of IRS with indexes and microfilmed abstracts of statutory law and court decisions concerned with tax law.

Computers are used to evaluate income and corporate tax structures and to estimate the economic effects of proposed tax structure changes.

Econometric analysis, also employing computers, shows the interrelation of such economic components as the consumer market, rate of investment return and corporate cash flow.

C. Armed Services Technical Information Agency

ASTIA, under the direction of the Air Force Systems Command, has planned a

¹ Although most European countries do not have a general compilation of laws, codification does exist in special fields, i.e., labor, civil and criminal procedure, commerce, and criminal law, etc.

² The same may be said for Mexico, for instance, labor, Legislacion Sobre Trabajo, 1963 to date; Taxation, Le Del Impuesto Sobre La Renta, 1948 to date; Natural Resources, Aguas, Bosques Colonizacion, Minasy, Petroleo, 1962 to date.

computerized processing of the United States Code and of the decisions of the Controller General. It has also prepared an index of terms in use by the Armed Services.

D. Federal Aviation Agency

The FAA plans to classify air law by computer. The law library at FAA has begun indexing legislative materials and FAA legal opinions.

E. Department of Justice

The Department of Justice has used computers to produce a desk book on anti-trust matters.

F. Oklahoma State University

The late Robert Morgan, Professor of Business Law, originated the "point-of-law" indexing approach with a demonstration in the gift tax field.

G. George Washington University

The National Law Center has experimented with the computerization of court and administrative decisions, and the rules of various Federal agencies. In cooperation with the Internal Revenue Service and the World Peace Through Law Center, the National Law Center is working on computerizing international tax law. These projects created and utilize the "descriptor" approach, which indexes material by various, predetermined classifications.

H. University of Nebraska

The Law School has pioneered cooperation between a university and a state legislature in computerizing statutory materials for the State of Nebraska.

I. University of California

John H. Jackson has indexed 3,000 documents of the General Agreement on Tariffs and Trade by document numbers, countries involved, and articles of the GATT agreement to which they are related.

J. University of Washington (Seattle)

Peter H. Rohn has coded the United Nations Treaty Series according to parties, time, subject matter, and textual references to international organizations. Professor Rohn's project involves a cumulative index of UNTS, as well as comparative profiles on different countries and a set of global trends.

II. PROJECTS EMPLOYING THE FULL TEXT OF SOURCE MATERIAL

A. University of Pittsburgh

Under contract with the Department of Defense, the University has indexed over 1500 international documents; the more heavily used will be printed with "key-word-in-context" indexes for the full text computerization system.

B. University of Pittsburgh Health Law Center

John F. Harty, Director of the Center and Chairman of the American Bar Association Committee on Electronic Data Retrieval, has recorded on magnetic tape the complete laws of the United States, the statutes of New York, New Jersey, and Pennsylvania, the health statutes of ten other states, and the Pennsylvania Attorney General's opinions on education. This project also uses the "significant word" approach to data retrieval.¹

C. University of California at Los Angeles

The Law School has researched the computerization of California law, while emphasizing the prediction of judicial decisions through computer interpretation of statutes and court cases.

¹N.B. A study has revealed that a collation by the Center of Welfare laws for the Pennsylvania State Welfare Commission and State Department of Justice, would, if done manually, have cost \$35,000. The cost by computer was \$5,000.

D. University of Iowa

Professor Allan Vestal is investigating the opinion writing practices of Federal District Court judges. He is using an IBM 1401 computer to sort out from a body of 3,000 opinions from fiscal 1962 those with the desired characteristics.

E. Stanford University

Jan F. Triska has prepared a study on the full-text computerization of the United Nations Treaty Series. He has begun development of a "key-word" retrieval system.

F. American Bar Foundation

The ABF has conducted research on full-text computerization of 5,000 court decisions from five Northeast states.

G. Southwestern Legal Foundation

The Foundation has developed the "root file" approach for retrieval of case law. All words in the original text are given root index numbers, and various forms of the word are collected under the appropriate root term.

H. State of Iowa

All bills considered by the General Assembly are recorded, along with their current status, on a General Electric 235 computer. As the bill's status is changed, the computer prints a new record of the bill. Every three weeks while the Assembly is in session, the Data Processing Division publishes all this information and distributes it to legislators and other key officials.

III. PROJECTS ON THE GENERAL APPLICABILITY OF COMPUTERS TO LAW

A. International Business Machine Corporation and Datatrol Corporation have conducted extensive research in this area.

B. The American Bar Association and Yale University publish "The Modern Use of Logic in Law" (Mull).

IV. SIMILAR WORK IN THE MEDICAL FIELD

Medlars

National Library of Medicine, Bethesda, Maryland.

Publishes: monthly Index Medicus; annual Cumulated Index Medicus; Bibliography of Medical Reviews (recurring).

Index Medicus: Medlars has reduced production time on this monthly issue from 22 to 5 days.

Bibliography: For special bibliographies (non-recurring), Medlars has reduced search, retrieval, and print time to two days. Material for these publications is stored on a Honeywell 800 computer.

Operation: 30 full-time experts index texts of 1500 medical journals from 60 nations which are published in 30 languages. This is done according to previously defined subject headings. Each article may be filed under several subject headings. This catalogue is then fed into the memory unit of the computer for special bibliographies and for the printing of recurring bibliographies and Index Medicus.

Data is stored on magnetic tape in the Honeywell 800 computer. It is then searched and edited to fill requests, and finally converted for printing.

Typesetting is done by phototypesetter at a rate of 1.7 lines a second or 300 characters a second. Printing is not done by the Medlars system, but is sent out.

Volume: The Medlars system handles 140,000 requests annually. 14,000 citations to journal articles are added monthly to the Medlars computer memory. Medlars usually furnishes only bibliographies, not full texts. But, full texts are available through microfilm.

Cost: The basic cost of this medical computer project was \$3,000,000. An annual cost of \$1,000,000 is required to update material,

since much medical information more than 10 years old is considered obsolete.

VIOLENCE IN GRENADA

Mr. RYAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. RYAN. Mr. Speaker, it is heartening that the Justice Department has successfully secured a restraining order requiring local officials to protect Negro schoolchildren in Grenada, Miss.

The entire world will be watching to see whether local officials in Mississippi will now uphold the law. This morning the Attorney General reported to me that matters now seem under control.

Mr. Speaker, it is difficult to imagine a spectacle more brutal than what took place in Grenada this Monday. According to press accounts, white citizens beat up Negro schoolchildren unmercifully, while local police officials watched in glee.

The children were being harmed, of course, because they were complying with Federal law and going to the school of their choice.

A number of us were so alarmed at these press accounts that we sent a telegram to the Attorney General asking him to send in Federal marshals and to seek appropriate indictments against those officials and others who violate Federal statutes.

While the Department has now taken action in the courts, it may still prove necessary to send Federal marshals to that town if local authorities prove unable or unwilling to enforce the law.

In any case, the entire incident is highly destructive to the cause of civil rights and to the spirit of the civil rights acts passed by this House. Even if Grenada now becomes quiet once again, the damage has been done. Negro families and Negro children throughout the South will have been effectively frightened.

As the Washington Post said in an editorial this morning:

Human beings everywhere must be revolted by what happened Monday in Grenada, Miss. . . . If the State can't control its thugs, the United States can . . . Let us give them one more trial. But if they fail again, let us quit paltering and send Federal troops into the State to maintain order. A touch of martial law might be a very civilizing influence to these barbarians.

At this point, Mr. Speaker, I insert in the RECORD our telegram and the editorial by the Washington Post:

SEPTEMBER 13, 1966.

HON. NICHOLAS DEB. KATZENBACH,
Attorney General,
Department of Justice,
Washington, D.C.

Once again local law enforcement in the South appears to have broken down completely. According to all accounts local officials have been unable and unwilling to keep law and order in Grenada, Mississippi.

We are shocked by reports that even little children have been beaten while exercising their constitutionally protected right to attend public school.

Federal officials bear an especially great responsibility for this situation since the integration of the Grenada school was in large part brought about by Federal officials acting under Federal law.

We urge that Federal marshals be dispatched to Grenada at once to protect the school children and other citizens of that community. We further urge that appropriate Federal indictments be sought against those citizens and officials who are engaging in flagrant violation of Federal statutes.

GEORGE E. BROWN, JR., PHILLIP BURTON, JOHN CONYERS, JR., DON EDWARDS, DONALD M. FRASER, HENRY B. GONZALEZ, SEYMOUR HALPERN, AUGUSTUS F. HAWKINS, PATSY T. MINK, RICHARD L. OTTINGER, ADAM C. POWELL, BENJAMIN S. ROSENTHAL, WILLIAM F. RYAN, JAMES H. SCHEUER, Members of Congress.

[From the Washington (D.C.) Post, Sept. 14, 1966]

GRENADA

Human beings everywhere must be revolted by what happened on Monday in Grenada, Mississippi. To some Mississippians it appears to have been an occasion for laughter to see children clubbed and maimed by adults armed with ax handles, pipes and chains. But to the civilized world, this is a spectacle too abhorrent to be longer countenanced.

The Mississippi mob vented its wrath on children lawfully attending two public schools in Grenada on the opening day of the new school year. One was an elementary school, the other a high school. As the children left their classrooms, screaming grown-ups fell on them. According to the Associated Press, "One Negro youth ran a gantlet of cursing whites for a full block, his face bleeding, his clothes torn. Another youth was thrown to the ground and stomped . . . Men did all the beating but many women were present, cursing and yelling."

Every community has its scum, of course. And if this were no more than the brutality of a few hoodlums momentarily out of hand, it could perhaps be regretted and dismissed as an aberration. But the ugliest aspect of what happened was that the law enforcement authorities of Grenada watched it all, not raising a hand to protect the helpless children. What manner of men can these be? There seems to have been such a default of moral and political leadership in Mississippi—by successive Governors, by the State's U.S. Senators in Washington, by local authorities—that the population as a whole has been corrupted and degraded to insensibility.

This is not an isolated incident in Mississippi. It is part of a pattern, fostered by official callousness, fomented by official contempt for the law. It is of a piece with the shooting of James Meredith when he walked on a Mississippi highway last June and akin to the mobbing of the civil rights marchers who came after him. It is in keeping with the killing of Medgar Evers in Mississippi in 1963 and with the murder of three civil rights workers in the State's Neshoba County in 1964. From January 1961 through May 1964 there were more than 150 serious incidents of racial violence reported in Mississippi. Most of these went altogether unpunished. "Every assault or murder which goes unpunished," the Civil Rights Commission warned in its report of last fall on Law Enforcement in the South, "reinforces the legacy of violence—the knowledge that it is dangerous for a Negro to depart from traditional ways."

The United States is directly concerned in this Mississippi primitivism. It is Federal law and the edict of Federal courts that Mississippians over and over again have flouted. And it is the image of America in the eyes of civilized mankind that Mississippians have grimed and disgraced.

Let us now put an end to it. If the State can't control its thugs, the United States can. Governor Johnson's initial reaction to the Grenada situation was to say that state troopers will be "as active as the situation requires where the local authorities call on them for help." But it is evident that the local authorities don't want help. Later, and more realistically, the Governor sent 175 highway patrolmen in full riot dress into Grenada to protect the Negro children. Let us give them one more trial. But if they fail again, let us quit paltering and send Federal troops into the State to maintain order. A touch of martial law might be a very civilizing influence to these barbarians.

GAO AUDIT CALLED FOR TO DISCLOSE EXTENT TO WHICH FEDERAL FUNDS ARE BEING MISUSED BY U.S. OFFICE OF EDUCATION

Mrs. REID of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Florida [Mr. CRAMER] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

Mr. CRAMER. Mr. Speaker, on August 23, and again on September 13, I took the floor of this body to discuss the Commissioner of Education's outright flaunting of the provision of title IV of the 1964 Civil Rights Act which specifically prohibits the granting of Federal funds to promote the assignment of students to public schools to overcome racial imbalance.

On August 23, I pointed out that over \$730,000 is being granted by Commissioner Howe to encourage what this Congress specifically forbade and that substantial portions of these Federal funds are in fact being used to aid in the busing of schoolchildren to suburban areas.

I have twice placed into this RECORD a copy of a letter I directed to Commissioner Howe in which I requested an explanation from him asking under what authority he is acting in granting funds for this prohibited purpose. I have yet to receive an answer from him.

It has also come to my attention that the U.S. Office of Education prepares what it refers to as a "Daily Press Digest" which contains reprints of newspaper articles dealing to some extent with integration problems. The September 9 issue of this digest contains an article from the San Francisco Chronicle which reports that 400 children from East Oakland will be bused daily to 7 schools in what the article refers to as "hilly white areas" this fall. The article goes on to quote the Oakland school superintendent, Stuart S. Phillips, to the effect that the plan is being financed by Federal funds out of an \$88,000 grant.

Mr. Speaker, not only is the Office of Education flaunting the law, but it is

using taxpayer's money to propagandize the fact in its Daily Press Digest.

In view of Commissioner Howe's refusal to explain this misuse of funds, I have directed the General Accounting Office to investigate this situation and to determine the extent to which the law is being violated by him.

Mr. Speaker, this is serious business. Congress, rather than the executive branch, is entrusted with the responsibility of appropriating money and Congress therefore has a corresponding duty to make certain that the money it appropriates is not wrongfully spent. If the Office of Education is allowed to ignore the mandate of Congress in this instance, and a precedent is set thereby, the congressional duty of legislating could be usurped by the executive branch with impunity in other instances as well in the future.

I can assure this body that I will take whatever further action is justified as a result of the GAO report.

Following, for the information of the Members, is the article which appeared in the U.S. Office of Education's Daily Press Digest that discusses the school busing of students in East Oakland, Calif., an admission being bragged about by the Office of Education through the circulation of the article by the Office itself:

[From the San Francisco Chronicle, Sept. 3, 1966]

SCHOOL BUSING FOR 400 NEGRO PUPILS

Some 400 children from three overcrowded predominantly Negro schools in East Oakland will be bused daily to seven schools in hilly white areas this fall.

Oakland Superintendent of Schools Stuart S. Phillips announced the integration plan—to be financed by Federal funds—at a press conference yesterday.

"Hopefully," he said, the busing plan and some other measures "will aid the district in developing exemplary patterns of city-wide integration."

VOLUNTEER

Children will be asked to volunteer as bus commuters from Lockwood, Woodland and Highland grammar schools, all in the heavily Negro flatland areas between East 13th Street and the Nimitz Freeway.

They will be transported to Henry J. Kaiser, Jr., Sequoia, Redwood Heights, Maxwell Park, Burkhalter, Charles P. Howard and Marshall schools, all located in more affluent neighborhoods.

Special human relations experts and a curriculum designed to assist the children from the poor areas will be available in the hill schools, Phillips said.

APPROVAL

The Oakland Board of Education approved integrating the hill elementary schools last Spring, Phillips said.

A Federal grant of \$88,000 will broaden the previous plan and other U.S. funds will bolster it still further.

Phillips and Dr. Tom MacCalla, director of special urban education services for the Oakland schools, said that children from the hill schools may be voluntarily transferred by their parents to the schools in the Negro areas.

"There has been no interest in the reverse integration program at this time," MacCalla said. He added, however, that the parents in the white areas probably did not know about the opportunity.

**REPUBLICAN POLICY COMMITTEE
STATEMENT ON 1966 AMEND-
MENTS TO THE FEDERAL WATER
POLLUTION CONTROL ACT, H.R.
16076**

Mrs. REID of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Arizona [Mr. RHODES] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

Mr. RHODES of Arizona. Mr. Speaker, at the September 14, 1966, meeting of the House Republican policy committee a policy statement regarding the 1966 amendments to the Federal Water Pollution Control Act, H.R. 16076, was adopted. As chairman of the policy committee, I would like to include at this point in the RECORD the complete text of this statement:

**REPUBLICAN POLICY COMMITTEE STATEMENT ON
1966 AMENDMENTS TO THE FEDERAL WATER
POLLUTION CONTROL ACT, H.R. 16076**

We support H.R. 16076 as it has been amended and reported by the Committee on Public Works. Under the provisions of this bill, the next logical step in the ever-increasing effort to end the wasteful and unnecessary pollution of this country's waters has been taken.

The Federal Government has long played a leading role in the improvement of our rivers and harbors and has financed and directed irrigation and flood control projects since the early 1900s; however, it was not until 1956 under the Eisenhower Administration that the first comprehensive Federal Water Pollution Control Act was enacted. Under this Act, grants were made to States and interstate agencies for water pollution control activities, and to municipalities for the construction of sewage treatment works. Also, a permanent procedure for governing Federal abatement action against interstate pollution was established.

Although the 1956 Act was a good beginning and laid a firm foundation for future action, it soon became apparent that, if this program were to be successful, there would have to be greater State financial participation in the construction of sewage treatment works. Thus, since 1959, the Republican members of the Committee on Public Works have insisted that any increase in the funds authorized for Federal grants must be used to accelerate needed construction by offering an inducement to the States to participate in the cost of treatment plants.

H.R. 16076, as reported by the Committee, accepts this principle. It contains substantial inducements to the States to participate in the cost of projects under both the accelerated existing program and the proposed clean rivers program. Thus, if a project is a part of an approved plan for a river basin, coastal waters, bays or lakes, it is eligible for an incentive grant of 10 percent above the basic 30-percent grant, and with no dollar limitation. The grant also may be increased by an additional 10 percent if the State agrees to contribute 25 percent for all projects under this program. This provision for incentive grants will bring the States more actively into the program, will reduce the need for future Federal funds, and will encourage local communities to provide adequate sewage treatment facilities.

Certainly the amounts that are made available for Federal grants must bear some relationship to the ability of the States and

local communities to utilize such grants. The amounts which would be authorized by this bill are, we believe, the maximum that can be used wisely. Moreover, a massive Federal program could hinder rather than help the overall effort by encouraging the States and local communities to believe that the Federal Government has taken over the water pollution problem and little or no effort on their part is required.

This bill, aside from providing for basin planning, is primarily an expansion of the existing Federal program of grants for construction of municipal sewage treatment plants. It does not attempt to solve the pollution problems that arise from the many sources unrelated to municipal sewage. Thus, the cleaning-up of the rivers of the nation unrelated to the treatment of municipal sewage will be the result of the pollution abatement enforcement provision and requirements for water quality standards in the existing law.

Through the adoption of a Republican amendment, the committee has in this bill laid the foundation for possible future legislation that could provide for additional pollution control and abatement. Under section 211 of this bill, the Secretary of the Interior is directed to conduct an investigation and study of methods for providing incentives to assist in the construction of facilities and works by industry to reduce or abate water pollution. This study shall include the possible use of tax incentives as well as other methods of financial assistance. The bill also provides for 70 percent Federal grants for research and demonstration projects for prevention of pollution of waters by industry. These provisions are highly desirable. They may point the way to a future solution of the pollution problems created by industry. Such a solution must and will be found, and this provision is an important first step.

In this period of extreme inflationary pressures and excessive Federal expenditures, every proposed increase in Federal spending must be carefully considered. This bill would authorize the Administration-recommended appropriation of \$2.45 billion for the fiscal years 1967-71. However, this authorization must be contrasted with the \$6 billion authorization for fiscal years 1967-72 which is contained in the Senate-passed measure. Moreover, it will fund a program that has been carefully devised to assist in solving a serious situation that demands immediate action. Under the provisions of this bill, the States, the cities and the communities will be encouraged to do their share in combating the common problem of water pollution.

We believe that the importance and the urgency of this task justifies the expenditure of the proposed funds. We, therefore, urge the enactment of H.R. 16076.

**REPUBLICAN POLICY COMMITTEE
STATEMENT ON THE VETERANS
PENSION ACT OF 1966, H.R. 17488**

Mrs. REID of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Arizona [Mr. RHODES] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

Mr. RHODES of Arizona. Mr. Speaker, at the September 14, 1966, meeting of the House Republican policy committee a policy statement regarding the Veterans Pension Act of 1966, H.R. 17488, was adopted. As chairman of the

policy committee, I would like to include at this point in the RECORD the complete text of this statement, as follows:

**REPUBLICAN POLICY COMMITTEE STATEMENT
ON THE VETERANS PENSION ACT OF 1966,
H.R. 17488**

The House Republican policy committee supports the Veterans Pension Act of 1966, H.R. 17488. This bill would provide a much-needed cost-of-living rate increase for all veterans and widows of veterans.

In this period of mounting inflation, escalating living costs and soaring interest rates, the pensioner, the social security recipient, and the individual with a fixed income has become the forgotten man of the Great Society. These Americans do not have this means or the weapons to combat inflation. They can only watch in helpless dismay as their purchasing power and savings melt away.

The seriousness of their situation is underscored by the fact that during July alone, the consumer price index increased 0.4 percent and using the years 1957-59 as a base, this index reflects that the cost of living has increased 13.3 percent. Moreover, the cost of services which elderly people are more likely to need than our younger citizens increased over 16 percentage points during the period from 1958 to 1965. And when services exclusive of rent were considered, the increase was 18 percentage points.

Although many veterans and widows of veterans are now subsisting under the barest and most meager circumstances, the Johnson-Humphrey administration has continued to oppose legislation that would provide a much-needed cost-of-living rate increase. Under the present circumstances, this opposition cannot be justified and we commend the Republican members of the Veterans Committee whose continued efforts have largely been responsible for the reporting of this bill.

While we applaud this bill, it should be noted that the Republican efforts to increase the veterans income limitation were defeated in Committee. As a result, for many veterans, the recent increase in social security payments will be more than wiped out by a far greater reduction of the veterans pension. We believe that this is an inequity which needs correction.

**COMMUNIST TERROR: CUBA—
PART 3**

Mrs. REID of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. ASHBROOK] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

Mr. ASHBROOK. Mr. Speaker, yesterday the Senate Internal Security Subcommittee heard the testimony of a former prisoner, Jose Manuel Santamaria, who had fled Cuba after serving 5 years in the Isle of Pines prison. To those familiar with the official policy of terror which is part and parcel of the Communist system, the brutal treatment of human beings described by Mr. Santamaria comes as no surprise. Whether one reviews the history of the Communist takeover in Russia, Latvia, Lithuania, or Estonia, in Yugoslavia or Rumania, the story is forever the same. Especially important to those who believe and trust in God is the cruel and

unrelenting drive to eradicate all vestiges of religion from the hearts of men. No longer, however, do the accounts of religious persecution emanate from thousands of miles away. Today, no farther than 90 miles from our southern shores, the same militantly atheistic ideology has set up shop. One wonders how much closer the threat must come before some American citizens become concerned. One wonders if some must hear directly the plea of the Jehovah Witness as heard by Mr. Santamaria:

"If you ever get away from this terrible island, tell the world of the horrors being imposed for preaching the Bible."

To broadcast this plea as far and wide as possible, I request that the article, "Senators Told of Horrors in Cuban Prisons," by Willard Edwards in the Chicago Tribune of September 14, 1966, be inserted in the RECORD at this point.

SENATORS TOLD OF HORRORS IN CUBAN PRISONS—SIMILAR TO NAZI CAMPS, REFUGEE TESTIFIES

(By Willard Edwards)

WASHINGTON, Sept. 13.—The horrors of the Nazi's Dachau and Buchenwald are being approached in the prisons and concentration camps of communist Cuba, a former prisoner told Senate investigators today.

Jose Manuel Santamaria, 29, who fled Cuba after serving five years in the notorious Isle of Pines prison where Cuban Premier Fidel Castro incarcerates his political opponents, described murder, torture, unmitigated brutality and starvation as the common lot of prison inmates.

PROTEST IS REPORTED

Santamaria's testimony was given to the Senate internal security subcommittee, headed by Senator THOMAS J. DONN, [Democrat, of Connecticut] despite the reported protests of Senator J. W. FULBRIGHT [Democrat, of Arkansas], chairman of the Senate foreign relations committee, who has dismissed communism in Cuba as a minor nuisance.

The refugee, now living in Hartford, Conn., was a student leader in the guerrilla movement which placed Castro in power and was given an army appointment but resigned in protest over Communist control of the Castro regime. He again took up arms, fighting in the hills, but was captured in January, 1961. After serving a five-year sentence, he took to sea with two companions last June and was picked up by a British tanker.

DYNAMITE IS PLANTED

During the crisis in October, 1962, when Russian missiles were discovered in Cuba, 80,000 pounds of dynamite were planted in the Isle of Pines prison, the witness said. In case of an emergency, the entire prison was to be blown up, killing 10,000 inmates, guards told the prisoners.

After the crisis involving the United States and Russia faded, the dynamite remained, Santamaria testified. Inmates always could see a guard stationed on a high hill, prepared to press a plunger, he said. The mental tension thus created caused 30 suicides and a number of mental breakdowns.

RELIGIOUS GROUP CONFINED

In Camaguiy province, on the north coast of Cuba, in a district so infested with mosquitoes that it is virtually uninhabited, about 200 Jehovah's Witnesses, a religious sect, have been confined to a compound for their beliefs, the witness said, they have no outer clothing, are given only cane sticks to eat, and slowly are dying of mosquito bites and starvation.

"If you ever get away from this terrible island," these sufferers told Santamaria, "tell

the world of the horrors being imposed for preaching the Bible."

"For the first time in my life, I cried," the witness told the subcommittee. "These were men whose only crime was that they wanted to speak about God."

TELLS OF TORTURE

Santamaria said he himself was tortured by electric shocks until he feared for his sanity and pleaded with his captors to kill him. Nine of his companions were shot to death before his eyes in an effort to make them identify their fellow rebels.

He told of prisoners being bayoneted because they moved too slowly. The food, he said, was "unspeakable" and only a few ounces of drinking water were provided daily. There were no toilet facilities.

WAS WITH AMERICANS

Santamaria estimated that the number of political prisoners at 38,000. Outside the prisons and concentration camps, inclosed by barbed wire, hatred of the Castro regime is intense, particularly among farmers, he said, and Cuban youths, conscripted into military service for \$7 a month, also are ready to rebel.

"I was with several Americans in prison," he testified. "I will never forget one, William Howard, a big, strong man, who was so enraged when he saw a guard knife a prisoner to death, that he literally tore a door off its hinges in an effort to help."

The subcommittee was told that many Russians, with members of their families, remain in Cuba, confined to areas which are off limits to Cubans. Recently, 200 big trucks transporting missiles, were seen in Las Vegas province. Each truck had a Russian driver, he said.

TRIP BY PROF. STEPHEN SMALE TO THE SOVIET UNION

Mrs. REID of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. Watson] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

Mr. WATSON. Mr. Speaker, this week the attention of the Nation was called to a very alarming and distressing report on the recent visit by a University of California professor to the Soviet Union. The trip by Prof. Stephen Smale was no ordinary courtesy call to the Soviet Union for the purpose of exchanging ideas. While in Moscow he called a press conference for North Vietnamese correspondents and promptly denounced American participation in Vietnam as "horrible and brutal." But, this only tells half the story, because this outspoken critic made these irresponsible remarks at the expense of the American taxpayers. His visit to the Soviet Union was made possible by a Federal grant of some \$13,000 for salary and travel in the Communist nation from the National Science Foundation.

This is indeed an outrage to every tax-paying American. It is shocking to learn that the National Science Foundation has used so little discretion and good sense as to allow a Berkeley professor to go to the Soviet Union and issue tirades against the efforts of this Nation to assist in securing freedom for the South Vietnamese people.

The National Science Foundation is in no position to claim that it was unaware of Professor Smale's pro-Communist activities. He has headed up the Fair Play for Cuba Committee and was cochairman of the Vietnam Day Committee at Berkeley which systematically carried out widespread protests against the war effort only last year. In addition, a subpoena was issued for his appearance before the Un-American Activities Committee hearings last month but was never served.

This Nation can ill afford the adverse publicity caused by a leftwing University of California professor who, armed with the taxpayers' money, is allowed to make subversive remarks in the very camp of the enemy. To let this activity go unnoticed is to betray the very ideals of our fighting forces in Vietnam. If this Government sanctions so-called academic freedom to the point where it disrupts national unity and undermines our military efforts, then it is time to make a reevaluation of any grant-in-aid program which allows American professors to visit Communist nations. If a professor wants to travel at his own expense, then that is his business, but to travel at the expense of the taxpayers and denounce this country is quite another question.

Federal agencies have an obligation to the American people to award various grants, which are made possible by tax dollars, to individuals whose loyalty to this Nation is unquestioned. Since the Berkeley College campus has been the foremost breeding ground for leftwing and subversive activities, the National Science Foundation should exercise extreme care in making grants to anyone at this institution.

COLOMBIA, GRATEFUL GOOD NEIGHBOR, ACKNOWLEDGES U.S. AID PROGRAMS

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. MATSUNAGA). Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. Conte] is recognized for 15 minutes.

Mr. CONTE. Mr. Speaker, I recently had the high honor and very great pleasure to accept President Johnson's invitation to join the official U.S. delegation attending presidential inauguration ceremonies in Bogotá, Colombia.

The trip was a great thrill for me, as I am sure it was for every member of the official U.S. party. It was an eye opener in many ways and, in particular, provided me with some fresh and reassuring insights on our economic aid program in Latin America, on the attitude with which it is accepted by the people of Latin America, and on the benefits it is bringing—both social and economic—to them and to the United States.

The official delegation representing President Johnson in Colombia was headed by Arizona Gov. Samuel P. Goddard, Jr., and included Senator JOSEPH MONTOYA, of New Mexico, and my distinguished colleagues and respected friends, Congresswoman HANSEN, of Washington; Congressman COHELAN, of California; and my fellow stater from

Massachusetts, Congressman BRAD MORSE.

The delegation also included the able Assistant Secretary of State for Inter-American Affairs, Mr. Lincoln Gordon; and our very capable Ambassador to Colombia, Covey T. Oliver.

In addition to a number of other State Department and protocol officials, we were also accompanied by Mr. Reynold E. Carlson, associate director of the Latin America and Caribbean program for the Ford Foundation.

The ceremonies inaugurating President Carlos Lleras Restrepo in the vast center hall of the national capitol in Bogotá were colorful and impressive, if somewhat different from our traditions and customs here in the United States. I think we were all a little bit surprised when, in the middle of the program, a young lady member of the legislature stood up to deliver an impassioned 45-minute rebuke of the new president. When she finished, she capped the performance by leading all of the opposition members out of the hall in an orderly but unmistakable gesture of dissension.

We were all struck, too, by the unusual beauty of the city, located 8,500 feet up in the Andes Mountains. It is a city, naturally, of diverse cultural backgrounds—the Indians, and the Spanish who first colonized the region—and there is ample evidence of both in the architecture, color, and design of the city.

The thing that impressed me most, however, during our brief visit is the tremendous job being done in Colombia by the young men and women of the U.S. Agency for International Development mission. I had a good opportunity to meet and chat with many of these people more or less informally, and I was frankly excited by the attitude of enthusiasm and vigor they all displayed, coupled with their mature and realistic grasp of the economic situation in Colombia and the means they had of helping to stimulate expansion and prosperity.

The guiding principle followed by our AID people there is to help the people help themselves. They give prime emphasis to programs that encourage the Colombians to use their own skills and resources, to work and plan for a future of self-sufficiency, free from any reliance on outside aid.

The AID group, for example, has encouraged the Colombian Government to establish a gasoline tax and to use the revenues for a highway construction program. Roads are atrocious down there and, since gas sells for only about 6 cents a gallon tax free, it seems there is great potential in the idea. The group has also encouraged a tightening of Colombian customs procedures in an effort to curb duty-free trade in so-called contraband merchandise such as American cigarettes.

One of the most inspiring accomplishments of the Alliance for Progress is the huge housing project just outside the capital city of Bogotá. It is called Ciudad Kennedy, after our late President. Some 100,000 people live here in new but modest homes, about 14,000 units.

Most of the residents of Ciudad Kennedy once lived in tin-roofed, ramshackle huts patched together from discarded pieces of wood and metal. They could be ruined by a heavy down-pour or a carelessly thrown match. A family of eight, for instance, had a two-room hut. The beds were homemade. There was no light or water. There was no bathroom. Meals, when they could be scratched together, were prepared in an open fire outside.

In the new housing project the new homes are very simple. They are small but comfortable. They are made of solid masonry, and they contain a living room, a bedroom, a kitchen, and a bath. Most of the people living in Ciudad Kennedy are still very poor. But their new homes are a bright ray of hope in an otherwise hopeless situation. Their children are warm and dry at night. When they become sick there is a nearby medical center to treat them. And in the daytime they go to school now, instead of roaming the streets or searching for scraps of wood for the home fire. There are playgrounds in the project too, and parks and paved streets and trees. It is a new world for these people and their children who once lived in depths of misery.

One of the truly inspiring things about Ciudad Kennedy is that every one of these new homes were built by the people themselves. This was the key element—self-help—that President Kennedy felt must be involved in his Alliance for Progress so that the people could share in the pride of accomplishment. For this particular project both the Colombian Government and U.S. Government agencies supplied the technical help and the construction materials while the people did the actual work.

The capabilities and achievements of the U.S. AID mission in Colombia provide a superb example of the tremendous possibilities for a well-administered foreign aid program. There is no question that it is helping Colombia establish a stable, growing economy, and at the same time is forging a firm bond of friendship and mutual respect with the United States.

It is apparent on all sides that the social and political climate is responding in like manner and is encouraging one of the more stable, democratic governments in Latin America.

Some measure of the gratitude and respect felt by the people of Colombia can be found in the remarks of their elected leaders.

Shortly before he stepped down to make room for Señor Lleras, former President Guillermo Valencia signed over a Government loan providing 5 million pesos to the Colombian popular cultural action program. The funds were derived from an AID loan.

President Valencia's remarks on that occasion are most illuminating. With members of the U.S. AID mission team present, including Acting Director Francis D. Fisher, President Valencia declared:

Let it be this moment to make known the deep and profound gratitude the Colombian people have toward the Government of the United States and toward AID and

the Alliance for Progress. When President Kennedy, in his immortal speech, offered this continent the policies of the Alliance, and fixed the conditions within which such policies could and should be evolved and developed, he created in reality the seed of continental solidarity which up until that moment had been barely sensed in vague declarations and international agreements without consequences of any depth in the life of our peoples.

For this reason I have never vacillated in considering that that speech of President Kennedy, in which he proposed the policies of the Alliance, is the greatest Pan-American document of all time and can only be compared, though exceeding in greatness, to that of President Monroe when he saved the sovereignty of this continent by notifying Europe that the reconquest of the colonies would not be possible, because America was for Americans.

I should underline that in President Kennedy's speech there are several fundamental points but there is one that applies to this gathering today. The President did not conceive these policies to increase the financial assistance that was in progress, nor for the normal development of the country, but rather he conceived them on the fundamental premise that the increased assistance of the United States to these Latin American countries would be to realize the transformation of living conditions in which these countries found themselves, based on the concept of priority for the health and education of the people.

For this reason I find it absolutely normal that a small part or portion of AID resources is destined for the popular cultural action program. Because if I, acting as the President of the Republic and after 4 years of hard and bitter experiences, were asked which is the most important moment or experience I have had, I would not hesitate to say it was the realization that the health and education of the people are the two foundation stones on the basis of which the transformation can be built; because so long as we do not effectively combat the illnesses that endanger us, and so long as we do not have even a minimum education which would permit us to understand, in order to resolve satisfactorily, the immense problems of the country, all that is said about development is premature and, above all, lacks a fundamental base.

In this manner we are satisfying, to the letter, the spirit of the policies of the Alliance which President Kennedy proposed and which the great President Johnson defined as the "vital Alliance"—that is to say, and so important, that the Alliance is vital not only for the United States but for the whole continent as well.

When President Johnson defined it as the "vital Alliance," not only did he characterize it in all its greatness and fullness, but he gave it another quality also, that if the Alliance is not effected it could be fatal for our countries because of the tremendous disillusion it would produce and the resulting impulsion of these peoples toward the Communist forces because of the failure of the Christian and Democratic forces which we wish to strengthen in America through the example and with the help of the United States. (Bogotá, Colombia, July 21, 1966.)

President Valencia's remarks, clearly, are a tribute to a sound idea and to the achievements of the dedicated people who are converting the idea to a reality.

In my judgment, all the men and women associated with the AID mission in Colombia deserve our sincere and heartfelt thanks and congratulations.

Tribute must also be made to Ambassador Oliver, through whose patience

and understanding, the AID concept was put across in Colombia and the way cleared for true progress.

On the eve of the inauguration of President Lleras, outgoing President Valencia had this to say about His Excellency Ambassador Oliver:

I wish to say of the Embassy of the United States of America in Colombia, that there we have always found comprehension, sympathy, and help when we have gone there in search of support. I wish especially to recognize the American Ambassador to Colombia, Mr. Covey T. Oliver, as one of Colombia's best friends, not only in his role as Ambassador of the United States but also as a person who has applied his extraordinary intelligence, his vast erudition, and his splendid character, along with a thorough understanding and all good will, which make him permanently outstanding among his peers. For these reasons, I wish to state today, when I have nothing to expect for him, that he merits the admiration, the gratitude, and the affection of the Republic and its people.

I can only second the thoughts expressed by President Valencia and to suggest that we look upon our foreign aid commitment and the AID mission in Colombia, working through the Alliance for Progress, as model examples of the way these programs can and should be conducted.

STAMP OUT OBSCENITY

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Oregon [Mr. WYATT] is recognized for 15 minutes.

Mr. WYATT. Mr. Speaker, it is more imperative today than any time in the history of our great country that we must stamp out obscenity and pornography. With the great economic and social changes of the past 50 years our youth is more vulnerable now than ever to the impact of obscenity and filth. It is obvious that existing Federal and State laws and current efforts to combat the national traffic in pornographic materials have not been effective. The spreading network of filth which is intended for juvenile consumption presents us with a problem which is no longer local in scope. We are faced with a gigantic industry which makes a profit, estimated in the millions of dollars, for unscrupulous individuals who earn their living by debauching our youngsters. Certainly there is a middle ground where children of the Nation could be protected from pornography without impairing constitutional rights. It is high time that we focus national attention on this serious problem which involves the morality and well-being of our youth. Last March I introduced a bill, H.R. 13892 which would create a commission to be known as the Commission on Noxious and Obscene Matters and Materials. The purpose of this bill is to coordinate activities on all levels to fight the national network of salacious material which is aimed at our young people. The 15-member Commission would include representatives of the Justice Department, the Congress, the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, as well as representatives of the clergy, the publishing business, the movie, radio, and

television industries, and the educational world. In order that my colleagues and all who are interested in this serious subject may be fully apprised as to the aims and purposes of my bill I am having it set forth here:

H.R. 13892

A bill creating a commission to be known as the Commission on Noxious and Obscene Matters and Materials

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,

FINDINGS OF FACT AND DECLARATION OF POLICY

SECTION 1. The Congress finds that traffic in obscene matters and materials is a matter of grave national concern. The problem, however, is not one which can be solved at any one level of government. The Federal Government has a responsibility to find more effective ways of preventing the transmission of such matters and materials through the instrumentalities which, under the Constitution, are subject to Federal regulation. The State and local governments have perhaps an even greater responsibility in the exercise of their police powers to protect the public, and particularly minors, from the morally corrosive effects of such matters and materials. Governmental action to be effective needs the support and cooperation of an informed public. It is the purpose of this Act to bring about a coordinated effort at the various governmental levels, and by public and private groups, to combat by all constitutional means this pernicious traffic.

ESTABLISHMENT OF THE COMMISSION ON NOXIOUS AND OBSCENE MATTERS AND MATERIALS

Sec. 2. (a) For the purpose of carrying out the provisions of this Act, there is hereby created a commission to be known as the Commission on Noxious and Obscene Matters and Materials (hereinafter referred to as the "Commission").

(b) Service of an individual as a member of the Commission or employment of an individual by the Commission as an attorney or expert in any business or professional field, on a part-time or full-time basis, with or without compensation, shall not be considered as service or employment bringing such individual within the provisions of section 281, 283, 284, 434, or 1914 of title 18 of the United States Code, or section 190 of the Revised Statutes (5 U.S.C. 99).

MEMBERSHIP OF THE COMMISSION

Sec. 3. (a) NUMBER AND APPOINTMENT.—The Commission shall be composed of fifteen members, appointed by the President, as follows:

- (1) One from the Senate;
- (2) One from the House of Representatives;
- (3) One from the Post Office Department;
- (4) Two from the Department of Justice, one of whom shall be from the Federal Bureau of Investigation;
- (5) One from the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare;
- (6) Three from the clergy; but no two members shall represent the same faith;
- (7) One who shall be a prominent librarian;
- (8) One who shall be a prominent representative of the book publishing industry;
- (9) One who shall be a prominent representative of the newspaper, magazine, and periodical publishing industry;
- (10) One who shall be a prominent representative of the motion picture industry;
- (11) One who shall be a prominent representative of the radio and television industries;
- (12) One who shall be a chief prosecutor of a city or county government; and
- (13) One who shall be a prominent educator.

(b) VACANCIES.—Any vacancy in the Commission shall not affect its powers, but shall be filled in the same manner in which the original appointment was made.

(c) CONTINUATION OF MEMBERSHIP UPON CHANGE OF STATUS.—A change in the status or employment of any person appointed to the Commission pursuant to subsection (a) of this section shall not affect his membership upon the Commission.

ORGANIZATION OF THE COMMISSION

Sec. 4. The Commission shall elect a Chairman and a Vice Chairman from among its members.

QUORUM

Sec. 5. Eight members of the Commission shall constitute a quorum, but three members shall constitute a quorum for the purpose of taking testimony or interrogating witnesses.

COMPENSATION OF MEMBERS OF THE COMMISSION

Sec. 6. (a) MEMBERS OF CONGRESS.—Members of Congress who are members of the Commission shall serve without compensation in addition to that received for their services as Members of Congress; but they shall be reimbursed for travel, subsistence, and other necessary expenses incurred by them in the performance of the duties vested in the Commission.

(b) MEMBERS FROM THE EXECUTIVE BRANCH.—The members of the Commission who are in the executive branch of the Government shall serve without compensation in addition to that received for their services in the executive branch, but they shall be reimbursed for travel, subsistence, and other necessary expenses incurred by them in the performance of the duties vested in the Commission.

(c) MEMBERS FROM PRIVATE LIFE.—The members from private life shall each receive \$75 per diem when engaged in the actual performance of duties vested in the Commission, plus reimbursement for travel, subsistence, and other necessary expenses incurred by them in the performance of such duties.

STAFF OF THE COMMISSION

Sec. 7. The Commission shall have power to appoint and fix the compensation of such personnel as it deems advisable, without regard to the provisions of the civil service laws and the Classification Act of 1949, as amended.

EXPENSES OF THE COMMISSION

Sec. 8. There is hereby authorized to be appropriated, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, so much as may be necessary to carry out the provisions of this Act.

DUTIES OF THE COMMISSION

Sec. 9. (a) INVESTIGATION, ANALYSIS, AND RECOMMENDATIONS.—It shall be the duty of the Commission—

- (1) to explore methods of combating the traffic in obscene matters and materials at the various levels of governmental responsibility;
- (2) to provide for the development of a plan for improved coordination between Federal, State, and local officials in the suppression of such traffic;
- (3) to determine ways and means of informing the public as to the origin, scope, and effects of such traffic, and of obtaining public support in its suppression;
- (4) to secure the active but voluntary cooperation of leaders in the field of mass media for the accomplishment of the objectives and purposes of this Act;
- (5) to formulate recommendations for such legislative, administrative, or other forms of action as may be deemed necessary to combat such traffic; and

(6) with the aid of the Nation's most outstanding constitutional authorities, to analyze the laws pertaining to traffic in noxious and obscene matters and materials; establish suggested definitions of noxious and obscene matters and materials, and to make such recommendations to the Congress for appropriate revisions of Federal laws as the Commission may deem necessary in order to effectively regulate the flow of such traffic, without in any way interfering with constitutional safeguards of freedom of speech or freedom of the press.

(b) REPORT.—The Commission shall report to the President and the Congress its findings and recommendations as soon as practicable and in no event later than January 31, 1966. The Commission shall cease to exist sixty days following the submission of its final report.

POWERS OF THE COMMISSION

SEC. 10. (a) HEARINGS AND SESSIONS.—The Commission or, on the authorization of the Commission, any subcommittee or member thereof, may, for the purpose of carrying out the provisions of this Act, hold such hearings and sit and act at such times and places, administer such oaths, and require, by subpoena or otherwise, the attendance and testimony of such witnesses and the production of such books, records, correspondence, memorandums, papers, and documents as the Commission or such subcommittee or member may deem advisable. Subpenas may be issued over the signature of the Chairman of the Commission, of such subcommittee, or any duly designated member, and may be served by any person designated by such Chairman or member. The provisions of section 102 through 104 of the Revised Statutes of the United States (2 U.S.C. 192-194) shall apply in the case of any failure of any witness to comply with any subpoena or to testify when summoned under authority of this section.

(b) ADVISORY COMMITTEES.—In carrying out its duties under this Act, the Commission (1) may constitute such advisory committees within States composed of citizens of that State, and (2) may consult with Governors, attorneys general, and other representatives of State and local government and private organizations, as it deems advisable. Any advisory committee constituted pursuant to this subsection shall carry out its duties without expense to the United States.

(c) OBTAINING OFFICIAL DATA.—The Commission is authorized to secure directly from any executive department, bureau, agency, board, commission, office, independent establishment, or instrumentality, information, suggestions, estimates, and statistics for the purpose of this Act, and each such department, bureau, agency, board, commission, office, establishment, or instrumentality is authorized and directed to furnish such information, suggestions, estimates, and statistics directly to the Commission, upon request made by the Chairman or Vice Chairman.

DAN FLOOD SCHOOL

Mr. HOWARD. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. KIRWAN] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New Jersey?

There was no objection.

Mr. KIRWAN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I wish to include therein two editorials from the Wilkes-Barre Times Leader concerning our good colleague the Honorable DANIEL FLOOD.

DAN represents the area in the Congress in which I was born. His people are proud of him for the fine record that he has made in the Congress of the United States and for the wonderful representation that he has given to our country and to the people of his home district.

It is a fitting honor that the new North End elementary school be named "Daniel Flood School" and I am confident that his colleagues in the House of Representatives are pleased, and are grateful to the people of his hometown who have conferred it upon him.

[From the Wilkes-Barre (Pa.) Times Leader, Sept. 2, 1966]

IT'S TIME FOR CITY TO RECOGNIZE OUTSTANDING OFFICIAL AND CITIZEN—DANIEL FLOOD SCHOOL IN NORTH END

Last December, the Board of Education in Wilkes-Barre approved a project to erect an elementary school in the North End to replace the outmoded buildings in use now. Subsequently, bids were opened, but the contract was not awarded. Construction, however, is expected to begin in 1967.

Recently, Dr. David Kistler, president of the Board, named a committee to select a name for the proposed school. Because it is to be located in the North End, Directors M. Donald Murphy, Joseph T. Mainwaring and George T. Yanik, residents of the area, were designated to serve on it.

A logical choice for the honor would be a North End resident if he were worthy and, of course, possesses the stature. For us, it would be an easy selection, for Representative DANIEL J. FLOOD has all the qualifications and meets every requirement.

In recognition of his public service, we respectfully propose his name to the committee and the Board of Education for the distinction.

Wilkes-Barre School District will be honored for the privilege of saluting him in life for his service. Decades hence, it would serve as a fitting memorial to him.

Representative Flood has received many tributes already, in addition to nine terms in Congress and a new one coming up in November for the enlarged district which now includes Columbia and Carbon Counties.

Although he is known nationally through his long service in Washington and an international figure through his travels and assignments, often as the President's personal envoy abroad, DAN FLOOD is best described as a man of the people.

A son of the late Mr. and Mrs. P. F. Flood and a grandson of Judge D. J. McCarthy, famed champion of the miners and friend of Presidents, he was born at Hazleton, but spent most of his life in Wilkes-Barre. Except for a time he was in school in Florida, Syracuse, Harvard and Dickinson, he always has maintained residence in the North End, while commuting to Washington.

For years, he lived with his father and sister, Mrs. Thomas Herbert, at 77 Madison street. After his marriage in 1949 to Miss Katherine Swank, a member of the Coughlin High School faculty, incidentally, he established residence at 460 North Pennsylvania avenue, an address he still calls home. His loyalty to the old neighborhood would not allow him to leave.

DAN FLOOD's interest in education stems from his days at Coughlin High School where he was president of his class and one of its most active members. That his wife is a former teacher has increased his enthusiasm. The public is well aware of his promotion of local industry and government building here, but many may be surprised to learn of the contribution he made to the progress of the Wilkes-Barre School District through federal funds he caused to be made available.

His career as a public official, leading attorney, noted actor, orator and indefatigable worker in all deserving causes is too well known to need any review here. It is unquestionably without parallel in the history of our city and country.

Wilkes-Barre Board of Education will enhance its reputation for non-partisanship if it avails itself of this rare opportunity to reward this outstanding citizen and official for service beyond the call of duty by naming the new school within sight of his home after him.

[From the Wilkes-Barre (Pa.) Times Leader, Sept. 9, 1966]

DANIEL FLOOD'S NAME APPROVED FOR SCHOOL

Formal action will be taken at the meeting of the Wilkes-Barre Board of Education next Tuesday evening to name the new elementary school in the North End after Representative DANIEL J. FLOOD for his outstanding service to the community as well as his constituents. Mr. FLOOD has resided in the area since he came here from Hazleton where he was born.

The name has been recommended by the special committee of directors and has been approved unanimously in conference, so the final step is only a formality. The fact that the directors were unanimous in their decisions add to the impressiveness of the tribute.

Once Representative Flood's name was proposed, the matter was practically settled, such was the weight of public opinion. There actually is no one else in his class, so far as meeting the requirements is concerned. There were a few other names mentioned, but none with a comparable record.

So the problem or what might have been a problem if Mr. FLOOD were not available solved itself, as this newspaper suggested editorially in voicing the sentiments of the public. While there is no mandate in such matters, if there were, the choice would be inevitable, for he is a public servant who is able as he is dedicated regardless of party, creed, or other consideration.

THE 4-H CLUBS—A CONSTRUCTIVE INFLUENCE

Mr. HOWARD. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. NATCHER] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New Jersey?

There was no objection.

Mr. NATCHER. Mr. Speaker, every year I enjoy the privilege of saluting the 4-H Clubs of America as they celebrate their national week. This year the week beginning September 24 has been set aside for this purpose and I have been looking forward to paying tribute to this unique organization for American youth, for it is indeed praiseworthy.

The 4-H Club program is a familiar one and a respected one. Fifty-two years ago the Congress of the United States enacted the Smith-Lever law which established the Cooperative Extension Service. Thus, in essence, began the official 4-H Club movement. Today, one-half century later, this organization which was founded primarily for farm boys and girls has grown to a national membership of some 2,500,000 and is open to all youth between the ages of 10 to 21 years of age. In 76 countries around the world its purposes and its methods have been adapted for use.

At various times 4-H Club members have come to Washington from our Second District of Kentucky to visit with me. Long ago the wise Greek, Socrates, admonished a young man to talk to him in order that he might see him and as my young friends talk, I am always impressed by the depth of their questions, their grasp of the issues at hand and I do see them. I see them—and I am impressed anew by their eagerness to accept the responsibilities that one day will be wholly their own. Some of my visitors are just entering high school and by the year A.D. 2000, as a new century begins, these same high school freshmen will have just passed middle age.

We may ponder and ask of ourselves—and of them—if they are prepared for the tasks that are ahead. But this need not cause us concern. One has but to consider the remarkable adjustments made by our present-day farm youth to the tremendous changes in our agricultural technology during the past two decades to know that, to them, changing conditions are but new challenges. Through strong leadership and organized efforts, our young men and women, whose ancestors scarcely went beyond the confines of their own rural environment, have widened their horizons and enlarged their goals through the correlation of these multiple changes into 4-H Club training.

During these changing times and in view of the fact that while our country gives much, it also demands much, we are often called upon to face new problems, resolve our differences, plot a course of action that will be worthy and representative of our country's best efforts. At such times it is well to reflect upon the determined courage of the men and women who gave us our precious heritage. We have by no means discarded our agricultural background. Our roots lie deep. Our country was born of the soil and we are not forgetful of the American farm and home from which our first legacies descended. Just as our forebears solved the crises of their days and their times, so will our coming generations meet the demands that are placed upon them.

The 4-H Clubs of America will continue to play a constructive role in the development of our country's future and from such a wellspring will come the leaders of tomorrow.

AN APOLOGY TO DIXIE

Mr. HOWARD. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. WAGGONER] may extend his remarks at this point in the Record and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New Jersey?

There was no objection.

Mr. WAGGONER. Mr. Speaker, there was an excellent cartoon reprinted in the Washington Post on September 11 which I wish I could insert here in the Record, because in a single drawing, the cartoonist captured the deplorable race situation in the North, East, and West of the Nation. One half of the cartoon

depicted the North saying to a race rioter who was headed to the South, "Go, Man, Go"; in the second half of the cartoon, the race rioter was, this time, heading north and the North was quakingly urging him, "Slow, Man, Slow."

This double standard is familiar to every Member of this body who has sat through the disgusting spectacle of recent civil rights bills here in the House.

But, since I cannot insert the cartoon, I would like to make available to everyone a recent radio broadcast which says, in prose, the same thing the cartoonist was depicting in his drawing. It is Paul Harvey's broadcast of August 3 which I have called "An Apology to Dixie."

DEAR DIXIE: Can you possibly find it in your heart to accept our sincere apology? When there was race rioting in Little Rock, Arkansas, we were so convinced that the cause was callousness. Our public officials and our press here in Chicago insisted that the only two reasons for Negro restiveness were your segregated schools and your stubborn Governor. We in Chicago with integrated schools and a very liberal Governor are now writhing in the agony of race rioting, and we seek to set our house in order, hoping your headlines will be kinder to us than ours were to you.

And when a Mississippi Negro boy was found drowned, we in Chicago called this the inevitable result of a white supremacy tradition. Now, a Negro girl, fourteen and pregnant, has been shot to death on the front porch of her own home in Chicago, and we're confused and ashamed and frightened.

What are we doing wrong that has made eight square miles of our city a battleground? Help us if you can find it in your own hurt heart to help.

And Alabama, when your State Police were photographed subduing rioters with nightsticks, Chicago's bold-faced front pages condemned you for indefensible brutality. And now . . . Illinois' National Guard has resorted to armored cars, and cracking skulls, and shooting to kill.

Your Governor had alleged that Communists were fomenting this strife and we scoffed; now thirteen Negroes on Chicago's West Side have been charged with plotting treason! We are sweeping, admittedly Communist literature from our littered streets! Forgive us, for not knowing what we were talking about.

And Georgia, when you were photographed in the act of turning back crowds of marching children, we could not control ourselves . . . "The very idea," the Chicago press editorialized, "that youngsters should be considered a menace sufficient to justify the use of tear gas!" Now, in our own asphalt jungle, we have seen Negro youngsters of 9, 10, 11, advance on police with drawn guns or broken bottles, screaming, "Kill Whitey!" And we used gas, and clubs, and dogs, and guns, and, God, forgive us, what else could we do? Can you, Georgia—can you forgive us too?

We tried the patience we had preached, honest we did. We tried so desperately that seven policemen were shot the other night—two of them through the back. So in the end we resorted to methods more brutal than yours. But, don't you see? We had to!

Our Mayor listened to the Negro's leaders as he so often admonished you to do. He had listened! He had made compromises and concessions! He had offered sacrificial police officials and school officials! But they keep coming from so many directions with so many demands! And then . . . demanding to keep the fire hydrants gushing for their playing children during the city's most critical drought!

Oh, dear Dixie, perhaps we had not yet learned fully to appreciate what you had been trying to do—to effect evolution without revolution. But for whatever belated comfort it may be, from our glass house we will not be throwing any more stones at you . . . not for a while.

CHANGE IN TAX LAW PROPOSAL BY INTERNAL REVENUE SERVICE

Mr. HOWARD. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the Record and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New Jersey?

There was no objection.

Mr. HOWARD. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to speak in opposition to the change in tax law proposal announced recently by the Internal Revenue Service. This proposal, if it became law, would disallow deductions for courses leading to a degree and for costs incurred for study or training to meet an employer's increases in occupational requirements. It would, in short, eliminate some of the few tax deductions now allowed to individuals for legitimate educational expenses.

As one who has spent a large portion of his adult life in the field of education, both as a teacher and an administrator, I can tell you that many of those teachers who do further their education and obtain advanced and enriched training, already do so at tremendous personal loss in time and money. This proposal would add another financial burden to the good teacher who wants to become a better teacher. This proposal would contradict the wise policies of the Federal Government regarding education such as the many Federal programs of assistance to elementary and secondary schools, construction of facilities for higher education, and financial aid for students in colleges and universities.

The well-deserved emphasis which education has had in recent years on all levels, State, local, and national, would be undercut. In the era in which we live today with its tremendous technological revolution in progress; with an ideological struggle going on, the outcome of which would change the destiny of man; when we hold the power in one hand to provide a future of abundance for all, and the power in the other to destroy all, it is hardly necessary for me to say, and obvious to all that the highest premium must be placed on the amount and quality of the individual's education. The proposed changes by the Internal Revenue Service are what appear to me to be shortsighted attempts to lower that premium. We must all recognize that attainment of the basic degree or credential is not, nor should it be, the end to formal and systematic higher education and study. These changes say to the teacher that, in effect, the policy of the U.S. Government will be to encourage you to discontinue, not continue, your education. Of special note here is that in applying to the schoolteachers of the Nation, this ruling would be a detriment not only to them, but also to the students

of America who would be deprived of the education they deserve, the very best possible.

From my teaching experience, I know it is often both financially burdensome and difficult in other ways to continue one's education so that one is able to become not only more productive and effective on the job, but also a more concerned and valuable asset to society as an individual. It is imperative that every encouragement be given to individuals who are willing to improve themselves through continued education, many times at great personal sacrifice.

STATEMENT OF HON. WILLIAM D. FORD ON WATER POLLUTION

Mr. HOWARD. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. VIVIAN] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New Jersey?

There was no objection.

Mr. VIVIAN. Mr. Speaker, the problem of water pollution is becoming a cancer on the face of our Nation. Lakes, rivers and streams throughout the United States have been turned into ugly, noxious cesspools of filth, poisonous chemicals, industrial wastes and untreated sewage. Luckily, the conscience of the Nation has been aroused. Voices are beginning to be heard, and public apathy appears to have been broken. One of the most cogent statements I have seen regarding the problem of water pollution was made recently by my distinguished friend and colleague, Congressman WILLIAM D. FORD, of Michigan's 15th District. His statement was presented before the Natural Resources and Power Subcommittee of the House Committee on Government Operations, during a hearing held September 9 in Toledo, Ohio. His remarks are worthy of a larger audience, and I submit them herewith, to be made part of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD:

I first want to commend you for the thoughtful work and planning which have gone into this hearing. I think it is significant that this Committee is meeting here in Toledo on the western shore of Lake Erie, for this lake, to our shame, is in the most advanced stages of pollution.

Water has always been, and continues to be, man's most abused natural resource. The fact that it has always been plentiful and seemingly inexhaustible has invited this abuse. Pollution of our water did not begin in this century. Public waters have always been used as a convenient waste-disposal system. For many years, there were no sewage-treatment plants or even the concern to build them.

Equally important, ground water was entirely overlooked as a possible source of pollution. Contamination of ground water through mining operations and septic tanks has added, undetected for years, to the general pollution of surface water.

The Industrial Revolution and mushrooming urban population increases brought only half-hearted efforts in the field of waste disposal. The present national crisis in water pollution was not recognized and averted when it was the most practical time to combat it.

Instead, we have pushed our out-dated treatment plants to the point where they are barely effective. Scientific advances which have made life more enjoyable—plastics, detergents, synthetic fibers, pesticides and medicines—are too complex to be broken down in present facilities.

Concern over pollution has grown as its effects have become more apparent. Commercial fishermen noted a decline in the quantity and quality of their catches on the Great Lakes, and traced it to modern day "wonder substances" which are highly toxic to fish. Geologists and conservationists have been warning us for years that a crisis was approaching.

It has been only during the last decade, however, that pollution made itself apparent enough to rouse the public. As recreational facilities became polluted to the point of danger, and game fish began to disappear, the public became aware of the problem. We must now push ahead quickly, with the backing of this public fervor, which is so necessary to obtain legislation, enforce regulations and authorize funds.

We who live near the Great Lakes feel most deeply the effects of water pollution. Knowing that we are all guilty, however inadvertently, we are ready for drastic steps to restore our lakes and rivers to their former beauty and purity.

Lake Erie is now in the most advanced stages of pollution. Being the shallowest of the five Great Lakes, it was the most susceptible to eutrophication, which is one of the most dangerous stages of water pollution. It gives the lake a marshy, weedy appearance, which in turn breeds mosquitoes, and it also leads to the formation of algae, which depletes the oxygen supply. Thus, nature's own purifying system is destroyed.

Eutrophication is self-supporting and self-multiplying. Like the rabbit family, its growth doubles, and then redoubles, over and over. Although research has not been completed yet on this phenomena, we do know that the removal of phosphates is a necessary step, and should be an important objective of this Committee.

But even though we have some new insights into the water pollution problem, and know that we need improved sewage-disposal facilities, we must not forget the problems which have helped to create this blight.

Industrial wastes have been curtailed somewhat in recent years, but not enough to alter the fact that it is still polluting our waters. Private industry has a three-fold obligation in this matter—an obligation to this nation which has given it a market, and freedom to grow; an obligation to the city in which it is located, and which provides employees and municipal services; and an obligation to itself as a taxpayer, and as a recipient of tax-supplied services.

With all these obligations, and with public opinion demanding that our waters be cleaned, private industry must work with the government to find solutions for its own particular waste-disposal problems.

We must also continue to make the individual citizen aware of his responsibility in the cleaning and preservation of our water supply. We are all to blame—from our ancestors, who thought there would always be plenty of clean water, to the younger generation, who must learn that littering our waterways is a serious crime.

Fixing the blame, and finding the causes, are but preliminary steps. We must now launch an intensive program to alleviate the problem. I think this program must include four important steps.

First, we need improved facilities to handle our waste. Secondly, we need legislative enforcement to stop the "criminals" who rob us of our God-given water resources. Third, we must continue our research and develop a planned program to solve additional water

pollution problems as they arise. And, most important of all, we need a continued awareness of the problem on the part of legislators, industry, and the individual citizen. All must be aware of their responsibility to themselves, their country, and to future generations.

This will require many things. It will require hard work, money and dedication. It will require a re-education of industry and the public regarding their flagrant use, and misuse of water.

We must keep in mind that any money which is not now invested, or any work not now begun and accomplished, will have to be doubled and tripled in the future, for the problem must eventually be met and solved.

I thank you very much for permitting me to present this statement, and please accept my sincere best wishes that your work will result in a successful effort to overcome one of the major problems of our day.

A DISGRACEFUL SITUATION

Mr. HOWARD. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Connecticut [Mr. MONAGAN] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New Jersey?

There was no objection.

Mr. MONAGAN. Mr. Speaker, on page 1 of the Hartford Courant edition of September 13, there appeared a story under the byline of Stephen J. Rechner in which it was stated that Connecticut stands to lose some \$100 million in revenue as well as having its shoreline polluted for the next 10 years because 10,000 gallons of crude oil were dumped into Long Island Sound in the Old Lyme-Old Saybrook area recently by an oil barge that ran aground off Old Saybrook.

This is a disgraceful situation and I am advised that Mr. Roger Griswold of Weston, Conn., has called it to the attention of the White House. I have for many years been much concerned about the problem of water pollution and I find no excuse for those persons who for personal interest and convenience create situations such as that which has been imposed upon Connecticut shoreline homeowners and residents. It was with such conditions in mind that in 1964, I filed H.R. 12374 and in 1965, I filed H.R. 2842 in the present Congress to authorize the Government to recover the cost of removing obstructions from navigable waters and to hold negligent boatowners liable for resultant pollution as well as for endangering navigation. My bill would amend the Refuse Act of 1899 and would provide penalties against boatowners in instances of negligence substantially endangering desirable marine, aquatic, or other plant or animal life of the navigable waters of the United States.

Mr. Speaker, my bill would provide relief and protection from this type of shocking situation which has come to Connecticut shores and I trust that this experience will cause the Committee on Public Works to recognize the urgency for immediate and favorable action on this legislation as a step forward in the process of remedying what I recognize as our most urgent domestic hazard—water pollution.

CULVER INTRODUCES MEASURE TO HELP CUT CRITICAL TEACHER SHORTAGE

Mr. HOWARD. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. CULVER] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New Jersey?

There was no objection.

Mr. CULVER. Mr. Speaker, earlier this month, schools in eastern Iowa opened their doors to record enrollments, but many of them started the academic year with at least one unfilled teaching position. The critical teacher shortage in our elementary and secondary schools is not confined to my district, but is an urgent problem which faces every area of the country.

At a time when we require educational excellence from our young people as never before, it is essential that we have not only enough teachers, but the best qualified ones possible.

It is for this reason that I am introducing in the House of Representatives today legislation which will clarify existing Internal Revenue Service regulations and permit a teacher to deduct from his gross income any legitimate educational expenses, provided they are not for the purpose of qualifying him for employment other than as a teacher.

Present tax laws permit deductions for ordinary and necessary business expenses, which have been variously interpreted by the Internal Revenue Service to permit deductions for some teachers while others have not received them. The IRS has now proposed to deny deductions for any educational expenses for teachers.

This Congress has taken major steps to improve the quality of our educational system, through bold new legislation like the Elementary and Secondary Education Act, the Higher Education Act, the cold war GI bill, and the Library Services and Construction Act. But if teachers are denied the right to deduct their advanced study expenses, and are thus discouraged from seeking additional knowledge of subject matter and techniques while they are teaching, we may lessen the effect of the positive action we have taken.

Our efforts now must be directed toward encouraging teachers to remain in the field and to attract additional college graduates to this vital profession, and I am most concerned that the IRS proposal would have just the opposite effect.

I therefore urge speedy consideration of this legislation to preserve these tax incentives, and request that the text of my proposal be included at this point in the RECORD.

H.R. 17717

A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to allow teachers to deduct from gross income the expenses incurred in pursuing courses for academic credit and degrees at institutions of higher education and including certain travel

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of

America in Congress assembled, That section 162 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 (relating to trade or business expenses) is amended by redesignating subsection (f) as (g), and by inserting after subsection (e) the following new subsection:

"(f) CERTAIN EDUCATIONAL EXPENSES OF TEACHERS.—

"(1) IN GENERAL.—In the case of a taxpayer who is a teacher during the taxable year or who was a teacher during any of the four preceding taxable years, and who attended an institution of higher education during the taxable year, the deduction allowed by subsection (a) shall include the ordinary and necessary expenses paid or incurred by him during the taxable year for—

"(A) tuition and fees required for his attendance at such institution, for courses for academic credit pursued by him at such institution, or for an academic degree;

"(B) books, supplies, and materials required for courses for academic credit pursued by him at such an institution or for an academic degree; and

"(C) traveling expenses (including amounts expended for meals and lodging other than amounts which are lavish or extravagant under the circumstances) while away from home attending such institution.

"(2) EDUCATIONAL TRAVEL.—In the case of a taxpayer who is a teacher during the taxable year or who was a teacher during any of the four preceding taxable years, the deduction allowed by subsection (a) shall include the ordinary and necessary expenses paid or incurred by him during the taxable year for travel while away from home (including amounts expended for meals and lodging other than amounts which are lavish or extravagant under the circumstances), if—

"(A) academic credit is given for such travel by an institution of higher education, or

"(B) such travel is accepted by the taxpayer's employer in satisfaction of educational requirements set by such employer or by the State in which the taxpayer is employed as a teacher.

"(3) DEFINITIONS.—For purposes of this subsection—

"(A) The term 'teacher' means an individual who is employed as a classroom teacher at an educational institution, or as a supervisor, administrator, advisor, or consultant in any capacity related to the instructional program of such an institution (including but not limited to guidance counselors and librarians).

"(B) The term 'educational institution' means an educational institution as defined in section 151(e)(4).

"(C) The term 'institution of higher education' means an educational institution which is authorized to confer baccalaureate or higher academic degrees.

"(4) EXCEPTIONS.—

"(A) Paragraphs (1) and (2) shall not apply to any expense paid or incurred by the taxpayer prior to the time he first performs services as a teacher.

"(B) Paragraphs (1) and (2) shall not apply to any expense paid or incurred by the taxpayer for the purpose of obtaining, or qualifying for, employment other than as a teacher."

SEC. 2. DEDUCTIONS FROM GROSS INCOME.—Section 62(2) (relating to definition of adjusted gross income) is amended by adding at the end thereof the following new subparagraph:

"(E) EDUCATIONAL EXPENSES OF TEACHERS.—The deduction allowed by section 162(f) for the educational expenses of teachers."

SEC. 3. EFFECTIVE DATE.—The amendments made by this section shall apply to taxable years beginning after the date of the enactment of this Act.

MRS. FLORENCE BARNASKEY

Mr. HOWARD. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from New York [Mr. OTTINGER] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New Jersey?

There was no objection.

Mr. OTTINGER. Mr. Speaker, on August 24 the community of Eastchester, N.Y., was saddened by the death of Mrs. Florence Barnaskey, one of its foremost citizens and a truly great patriot.

Over the years, she made many significant contributions to the civic life of her community. No patriotic observance was complete without her leadership and participation.

During my first term in office, I corresponded with Mrs. Barnaskey on a number of occasions and sensed her deep dedication to her community and her great love of country.

In recognition of the respect and affection in which she was held, I submit herewith the following articles which appeared in the Eastchester, N.Y., Record following her untimely death:

MRS. FLORENCE BARNASKEY, 42-YEAR
EASTCHESTER RESIDENT, DEAD

Mrs. Florence Barnaskey died on Wednesday, August 24th at the Lawrence Hospital in Bronxville. Mrs. Barnaskey had been a resident of Eastchester for 42 years. She had been an outstanding leader in the ceremonial affairs of the American Legion and Veteran Posts in Eastchester. She was a frequent contributor to the Eastchester Record on civic and patriotic events.

Mrs. Barnaskey was a charter member of the St. Luke's Women's Auxiliary; a member of the Marble Lodge, Chapter 704, Order of the Eastern Star; a member of the Maine Auxiliary, No. 28, of the Spanish American War Veterans; a member of the Woman's Auxiliary of the American Legion, LeRoy Gregory Post 794.

Her husband was a veteran of the Spanish American War and her two sons served in World War II. On Memorial Day of this year she was presented with a trophy by the Central Conference of Veterans for her many years of active participation in the Memorial Day Ceremonies in Eastchester.

During the years of World War II, the American Flag flew night and day before her home on Fisher Avenue. She would not take it down until her boys came home and the war was over. She received national recognition in the papers across the nation and a letter of commendation from the White House.

She is survived by two sons, John Barnaskey of 888 Post Road in Eastchester and George Barnaskey of Oklahoma; a daughter, Mrs. Florence Staebler of Mt. Vernon, a brother, Alex Winger of New Jersey and seven grandchildren. Church services were held on Saturday morning at the St. Luke's Church in Eastchester.

Large crowds gathered at the Westchester Funeral Home to pay their last respects to this outstanding woman who was admired and respected for her devotion to God and Country.

MRS. BARNASKEY EULOGIZED BY O'ROURKE

Francis X. O'Rourke issued the following statement from his office in Town Hall.

"It is with deep regret that we note the passing of one of Eastchester's most loved citizens, Mrs. Florence Barnaskey. For over forty years, we have observed her dedication

and patriotic affection for the American flag. Her devotion to God and Country is well known to all of the people of Eastchester. She was a woman of great charity and kindness. She rejoiced in the success of others and her friendly pen documented a chronological record of Eastchester and its people. Her pen is still. Her familiar, gallant, marching figure will be missed in our parades, but her spirit will remain a beautiful memory to all of us, as long as the American flag flies over a land she loved so dearly."

PRESCRIPTION FOR A SICK INDUSTRY

Mr. HOWARD. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from New York [Mr. ROSENTHAL] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New Jersey?

There was no objection.

Mr. ROSENTHAL. Mr. Speaker, having been a member of the National Commission on Food Marketing for the past 2 years, I am naturally most interested in any reports, articles or stories on the work of that agency.

In the September 19 issue of *The Nation* there is a most objective critique on the recent report of the Commission, written by Miss Jennifer Cross, a British free-lance journalist, now residing in this country.

Miss Cross' methodical discussion of the facts and principles involved, and her conclusions, are, in my judgment, most interesting and provocative. It is important that we obtain as broad a reaction as possible to the results and recommendations of the study undertaken by the Commission. Her remarks are therefore most welcome, and I would like to take this opportunity of including her article at this point in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

The article, entitled "Prescription for a Sick Industry," follows:

REPORT ON FOOD: PRESCRIPTION FOR A SICK INDUSTRY

(By Jennifer Cross, a British free-lance journalist now living in Berkeley, Calif.)

On June 27, the report of the National Commission on Food Marketing went to Congress, after two years of diligent study on every major facet of the food industry. It had been rather like the rigorous medical examination of a patient who believed he was healthy, but whose doctor thought he detected dangerous symptoms. Is America's largest industry as well as it claims to be, or is it malfunctioning, and if so, where, and what can be done about it? Predictably, the 113-page diagnosis (plus ten separate studies) has a lot to say for both sides. The patient is in pretty good shape, but there are no grounds for complacency: enough is wrong to warrant a good deal of concern, some government action and a lot more investigation.

The maladies, says the report, are nobody's fault, and are certainly not caused by attempts of manufacturers and retailers to bilk either the farmers or the public. Rather, they stem from new facts of economic life of the last twenty years: the swing from a production to a marketing orientation, the startling technological changes in agriculture and food processing, the population growth and the emergence of a new, wealthy

consumer who uses food not merely as something to eat but as an outlet for affluence.

The first result has been to threaten the traditional balance of competition within the industry. The commission reported an increased concentration in retailing and manufacturing, shown in and aggravated by the extinction of 133,000 small-to-medium-sized stores during the period 1948-63, and by the rising number of horizontal and vertical mergers. Large firms have been gobbling up small or medium ones; retailers have been moving into food processing, processors into food production, and all at an accelerated rate since 1954. Today, concentration is most extreme among retail and wholesale food buyers, and manufacturers of baby food, soap, coffee, cake mixes, shortening, crackers and cookies, where 50 per cent or more of the market is held by the four largest firms. Some of the biggest companies, especially among retailers, have grown beyond the size needed for maximum efficiency. Medium-sized firms are just as competent to process and distribute, and the only edge held by the giants is in advertising, promotion and sales, where their superior resources affect competition, placing the smaller retailer or manufacturer in an increasingly poor bargaining position.

While the industry is regarded as generally efficient, there is considerable room for improvement, notably in retailing. Gross margins—the spread between what the farmer gets and what the consumer pays—have gone up from 15 to 17 per cent of sales in 1954 to 19 to 22 per cent ten years later. This is partly due to inflation but also to higher operating costs. The main items in this overhead are advertising and promotion, including trading stamps, labor, the cost of owning or renting store facilities, plus services (check cashing, parking space, etc.). And, unlike similar costs in many other industries, they are not being offset by a comparable boom in productivity.

Drawing the line between legitimate effort and extravagance is not easy, but the commission has left little doubt that it would place a good deal of advertising and promotion in the latter category. To put it bluntly, the high cost of selling is being passed on to the consumer, with no equivalent enhanced value in return. Food manufacturers' advertising, now running at \$2.2 billion, wastes too much money simply urging housewives to buy brand A instead of brand B. New products, notoriously difficult to launch, often cost 57 per cent of their first year's sales in advertising, without guarantee of a long or successful life. While the manufacturers absorb the cost, they can do so only at the ultimate expense of other products, so one way or the other the public pays. The public also pays for the privilege of saving trading stamps, almost unknown in 1955, but now distributed by 47 per cent of all food stores. This gimmick adds an annual \$680 million to the national food bill.

Apart from these little extras, which he may or may not be delighted to pay for, the consumer gets a good deal for his money. A note of cautious praise runs through the whole diagnosis, though the report soft-pedals the industry's boasts about being the envy of the world, and squashes the idea that the declining percentage of the family budget being spent on food is necessarily a sign of industry efficiency. The only other major consumer gripe is packaging—the report endorses the evidence of Sen. PHILIP A. HART's Truth in Packaging hearings that the consumer is frequently confused, sometimes misled, and generally hindered from getting the best value for his money. (See Jennifer Cross: "Truth in Packaging, The Supermarket Caper," *The Nation*, February 21.) Also, the low-income shopper does not fare well. A special price survey done by the Bureau of Labor Statistics in six major cities proves

that in certain circumstances the poor do pay more. Owing to the scarcity of supermarkets, they patronize "mom and pop" stores, where prices average 2.8 per cent higher, and, lacking cash, buy smaller, more expensive quantities.

The farmer, however, is unequivocally in a worse position than formerly. With retailers pooling their buying, and with their entry into food processing, plus the expansion of some food manufacturers into cattle feeding and egg production, the grower's bargaining power is substantially weakened. Terminal markets are declining, buyers are becoming fewer in number and powerful enough to get away with sloppy, informal and sometimes unfair bargaining. This, combined with lack of reliable and up-to-date information about price futures and market conditions, is eroding the whole idea of price as the basis for negotiation, besides leaving farmers at the mercy of the spasmodic overproduction fostered by today's agricultural technology.

The remedy for these various ailments is some fairly harsh medicine, at least for the manufacturers, retailers and advertisers, who traditionally detest any extension of federal authority ("interference") unless it is for their benefit. The report makes it clear that traditional legislation and the limited powers of regulatory agencies are inadequate to meet the new situation. Therefore, the growing degree of concentration, particularly mergers not in the public interest, should be met by legislation requiring compulsory pre-merger notification; temporary cease and desist powers for the Federal Trade Commission and the Department of Justice to enable them to halt mergers pending legal investigation; and firmer guidelines for the more effective enforcement of the antitrust laws.

For consumers, the report suggests a special agency in the Executive branch of the government to take over the protective functions now exercised by existing federal agencies represent the consumer at law, and attempt the vital but herculean task of teaching him to be a more intelligent buyer. The FTC and the Food & Drug Administration should make a more determined effort to prevent deceptive labeling and packaging, aided by legislation if necessary. Finally, consumer grades and standards of identity should be established for and appear on, all foods where feasible.

Government help is recommended to improve farmers' bargaining power by creating agricultural marketing boards, strengthening farmers' cooperatives, and authorizing federal marketing agreements and orders. Better current and future price reporting should be carried out by the Department of Agriculture, with the authority to extract the necessary information from buyers and growers, along with timely market reports of selected perishable farm products. The department should also develop a model code for the licensing and operation of local livestock markets, and study the effects of transportation costs and of trade barriers affecting agriculture.

The main weakness of the conclusions is that the fifteen commission members fell out among themselves, so that the report presents the views of the majority of nine, followed by separate statements of the six dissenters. The split occurred not along party lines but roughly between liberals and conservatives, with the liberals (chairman Phil S. Gibson, former California Chief Justice; Fred J. Marshall, farmer and former Congressman from Minnesota; Elmer R. Kiehl, dean of the University of Missouri College of Agriculture; Senators WARREN G. MAGNUSON, GALE W. MCGEE and PHILIP A. HART; Congressmen LEONOR K. SULLIVAN, GLENN C. CUNNINGHAM and BENJAMIN S. ROSENTHAL) in the lead. Still more unfortunately, the

dissenting minority (William M. Batten, chairman of the J. C. Penney Co.; Albert K. Mitchell, New Mexico rancher; Senators THURSTON B. MORTON and ROMAN L. HRUSKA; Congressmen GRAHAM PURCELL and CATHERINE MAY) disagreed with practically all the majority proposals, accusing their colleagues of arriving at their verdict before all the technical evidence was in and of exceeding Congress' brief by recommending changes in government and legislative policy.

Obviously, many of the majority conclusions are open to challenge, especially the recommendations about food-industry concentration and the wisdom of establishing a department of consumers—about which even a handful of the President's Committee on Consumer Interests lately could not agree. However, the accusations of jumping the gun on the evidence have been publicly denied by Dr. George E. Brandow, NCFM executive director, while the commission brief, as set out in public law 88-354, specifically asked for findings and conclusions on legislation and public policy. Otherwise, the minority statements contain suspicious echoes of the food-industry line as laid down by retailers, manufacturers and trade associations . . . the industry is fine, let it alone; government intervention stifles initiative and flexibility; consumers are sovereign, rational and efficient, they don't need protection.

Profiting by the doctor's dilemma, the patient has loudly expressed his dislike of any advice which strikes him as misplaced or unpalatable. Ever since the end of March, when the draft report was mysteriously leaked to *Advertising Age*, it was clear that the industry was going to clobber it. While some, particularly food chains, have wisely refused to comment until they have thoroughly digested the evidence, others have expressed their shock, disappointment and disapproval of the main conclusions, taking their stand on the minority tribute to the *status quo*. All these views have subsequently made headlines in the advertising and food trade press, and been given a comprehensive roundup in *Progressive Grocer*. The only dissenting voice has been that of the National Farmers Union, which was relieved and gratified to find many of its views confirmed, especially the need to protect farmers from marketing abuses.

That the report's recommendations will be carried out is, to say the least, uncertain. Industry critics plainly hope and expect the whole thing to fade away and die. "Indications are," said *Supermarket News*, that "it may stay in the 'fuzzy' realm for years without having a direct or significant effect on federal legislation affecting industry." The press consensus was that the President's reception of the report was distinctly chilly, though his remarks could better be interpreted as noncommittal rather than hostile. It should also be noted that the press was given, if not its orders, at least a very strong hint by the president of General Foods, who urged the National Editorial Association two years ago to identify "the fiction that comes out of Washington," and use their "critical editorial judgment" on the report, in the interest of truth, of course, and to prevent the innocent public from getting the gripes.

The chance of legislative action this session is almost nil, since the report is currently being studied by the Bureau of the Budget; as for the future, the fate of the recommendations depends on how the Administration views the wisdom of backing the considerable extension of federal power that will be involved. Undoubtedly a good deal of political capital will be made out of it during the Congressional elections. However, the report will fare better in the long run if its suggestions are carried out piecemeal by the appropriate agencies. Already the FTC and the Department of Justice are taking a more active interest in mergers which might violate the antitrust laws (e.g., in the dairy

industry) and the possibility of strengthening Title 7 of the Clayton Act is currently being discussed in Washington. The report will certainly give a boost to pending consumer legislation, particularly Truth in Packaging, which may pass the House this session, and a bill (HR 7179) proposed by NCFM member Representative BENJAMIN S. ROSENTHAL, Democrat, of New York, to create a department of consumers.

Another side effect may well be the incentive to certain sections of the food industry to plug the gaps in their performance, if only to forestall government action. The issues were squarely put in a speech in May to the Magazine Promotion Group by Edward L. Bond, Jr., president of Young & Rubicam. "You and I know that not everything is right in the market place—or in advertising, either. And the problems that exist are creating increasing demands for government attention. The question, however, is whether we are going to sit back and abdicate to the government—or whether we're going to face up to our problems, where they exist, and engage in more self-regulation and self-policing. . . ." Packaging already engages industry attention. Consumer education may be the next—though, as industry people rightly complain, consumers make exceedingly poor use of what is available. Trading stamps, now regarded as a mixed blessing, will probably get yet another critical look. Last year some 800 supermarkets, mostly chains, stopped giving stamps; others, like Safeway, dislike them but bow to consumer demand.

Even the vexed question of how to increase the number of supermarkets in low-income areas may be reconsidered. Mrs. Esther Peterson, special assistant to the President for consumer affairs, has issued a personal appeal to food chains to "immediately re-examine their expansion plans," while Dr. Brandow tossed in the suggestion that they might operate a "no frills" service in poor areas under a different name. The main obstacles, according to Clarence G. Adamy, National Association of Food Chains president, are technical: local tax laws make property improvements in low-income areas financially unattractive, while many chains have encountered enormous problems in clearing title to sufficient land to hold a store large enough to generate the volume necessary for low-margin selling. But, he added, the interest is there.

While the food industry ponders the NCFM prescription—which, with the technical data, will become the standard textbook in marketing, agricultural and university circles for some time to come—consumers would do well to consider some of the points that have been raised. The housewife pays for a lot of in-comestibles along with the family food: packaging, processing, advertising, trading stamps, bonus bingo, larger, enticing stores with ancillary services. Most women, if they think about it at all, regard this as money well spent. But the minority who want to buy only the best food at the lowest price, or are on a tight budget—and this includes some middle-class intellectuals, some young marrieds and many of the poor—will be interested to know that alternatives are available. Scattered about the report is material which could be turned into excellent shopping advice; for example, avoid trading stamps, buy store "specials" and retailers' own brands instead of nationally advertised products.

Most of it, alas, will probably fall on deaf ears, since the average woman is a sloppy shopper and appears to like it that way. Consumer education is still in its infancy, at least compared to commercially financed techniques of persuasion like advertising and public relations, but the situation is changing. Spreading out from Washington is an upsurge of interest in teaching the public

how to be more discriminating consumers. This type of education is becoming an integral part of the anti-poverty program, and if Esther Peterson has her way it will be extended to the high school. Here, the NCFM report will be of value—a timely contribution to the complex art of consumership which is our best defense against drowning in our affluent society.

THE PROPOSED BISCAYNE NATIONAL MONUMENT

Mr. HOWARD. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Florida [Mr. GIBBONS] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New Jersey?

There was no objection.

Mr. GIBBONS. Mr. Speaker, I have today joined in cosponsoring legislation to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to establish the Biscayne National Monument in the great State of Florida. This legislation is vitally needed to preserve and protect for future generations a rare combination of terrestrial, marine, and amphibious life in an area of great natural beauty.

In their present relatively undeveloped state, the upper Florida Keys and the adjoining waters and submerged lands of Biscayne Bay and the Atlantic Ocean are an environmental element highly important to Florida and a valuable recreation resource for the Nation.

The best vestiges of south Florida's tropical forest are within the boundaries of the proposed national monument. Some of the plants are species not found on the mainland, and it is highly desirable that we preserve them.

In addition to the conservation value, the proposed monument will offer unusual opportunities for recreation in many interesting forms such as boating, sailing, swimming, picnicking, hiking, camping, and nature study. The clear waters of Biscayne Bay and the Atlantic Ocean will provide some of the finest conditions in the world for skin diving and underwater nature study.

Mr. Speaker, America needs more recreational areas to serve our rapidly growing population. Establishment of the Biscayne National Monument will be a major step forward in meeting this need.

WHAT IS POVERTY?

Mr. HOWARD. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Florida [Mr. GIBBONS] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New Jersey?

There was no objection.

Mr. GIBBONS. Mr. Speaker, I have, from time to time, included in my speeches in the House, newspaper accounts and articles that have given additional insight as to the aims and objectives of the war on poverty. Most of this commentary on the poverty program has been from professionals who have evaluated the program and have written

constructively as to its merits and shortcomings.

Rarely do we have an opportunity to hear from those who are the ones which this program is intended to assist. I would like to include in the RECORD today a firsthand account entitled "What Is Poverty?" which was recently published in one of my local newspapers, *La Gaceta*. *La Gaceta* is perhaps the only trilingual newspaper in the United States. Its editor, Roland Manteiga, of Tampa, Fla., is the author of a widely read political column and has oftentimes been commended for his insight and perceptive reporting.

I found this article to be a most moving account from a woman who has experienced the evils of poverty. I am including it in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD so that others might share in a deeper understanding of what poverty means to such an individual:

WHAT IS POVERTY?

You ask me what is poverty? Listen to me. Here I am, I am dirty, smelly and with no "proper" underwear on and with the stench of my rotting teeth near you. I will tell you. Listen to me. Listen without pity. I cannot use your pity. Listen with understanding. Put yourself in my dirty, worn out, ill fitting shoes, and hear me.

Poverty is getting up every morning from a dirty and illness stained mattress. The sheets have long been used for diapers. Poverty is living in a smell that never leaves. This is a smell of urine, sour milk, and spoiling food sometimes joined with the strong smell of long-cooked onions. Onions are cheap. If you have smelled this smell, you did not know how it came. It is the smell of the outdoor privy. It is the smell of young people who cannot walk the long dark way in the night. It is the smell of the mattresses where years of "accidents" have happened. It is the smell of the milk which has gone sour because the refrigerator long has not worked, and it costs money to get it fixed. It is the smell of rotting garbage. I could bury it, but where is the shovel? Shovels cost money.

Poverty is being tired. They told me at the hospital when the last baby came, that I had chronic anemia caused from poor diet, a bad case of worms, and that I needed a corrective operation. I listened politely—the poor are always polite. The poor always listen. They don't say that there is no money for iron pills, or better food, or worm medicine. The idea of an operation is frightening. Who takes care of my children? Recovery from an operation takes a long time. I have three children. When I left them with "Granny" the last time I had a job, I came home to find the baby covered with fly specks, and a diaper that had not been changed since I left. When the dried diaper came off, bits of my baby's flesh came with it. My other child was playing with a sharp bit of broken glass, and my oldest was playing alone at the edge of a lake. I made \$22 a week and a good nursery school costs \$20 a week for three children. I quit my job.

Poverty is dirt. You say in your clean clothes coming from your clean house, "anybody can be clean." Let me explain about housekeeping with no money. For breakfast I give my children grits with no oleo or cornbread, without eggs or oleo. This does not use up many dishes. What dishes, there are, I wash in cold water and with no soap. Even the cheapest soap has to be saved for the baby's diapers. Look at my hands, so cracked and red. Once I saved for two months to buy a jar of Vaseline for my hands and the baby's diaper rash. When I had saved enough, I went to buy it and the price

had gone up two cents. The baby and I suffered on.

I have to decide every day if I can bear to put my cracked, sore hands into the water and strong soap. But you ask why not hot-water? Fuel costs money. If you have wood fire it costs money. If you burn electricity, it costs money. Hot water is a luxury. I do not have luxuries. I know you will be surprised when I tell you how young I am. I look so much older. My back has been bent over wash tubs every day for so long. I cannot remember when I ever did anything else. Every night I wash every stitch my school age child has on and hope her clothes dry by morning. Poverty means insects in your food, in your nose, in your watch the fire knowing one spark on the newspaper covering the walls means your sleeping children die in flames. In summer, poverty is watching gnats and flies devour your baby's tears when he cries. The screens are torn and you pay so little rent you know they will never be fixed. Poverty means insects in your food, in your nose, in your eyes, and crawling over you when you sleep. Poverty is hoping it never rains because diapers won't dry when it rains and soon you are using newspapers. Poverty is seeing your children forever with runny noses. Paper handkerchiefs cost money and all your rags you need for other things. Even more costly are antihistamines. Poverty is cooking without food and cleaning without soap.

Poverty is asking for help. Have you ever had to ask for help, knowing your children will suffer unless you get it? Think about asking for a loan from a relative, if this is the only way you can imagine asking for help. I will tell you how it feels. You find out where the office is that you are supposed to visit. You circle that block four or five times. Thinking of your children, you go in. Everyone is very busy. Finally someone comes out and you tell her you need help. That never is the person you need to see. You go see another person and, after spilling the whole shame of your poverty all over again, you find that this isn't the right office after all—you must repeat the whole process. And it never is any easier at the next place.

You have asked for help and, after all it has cost you, you are again told to wait. You are told why, but you don't really hear because of the red cloud of shame and the rising black cloud of despair.

Poverty is remembering. It is remembering quitting school in junior high because "nice" children had been so cruel about my clothes and my smell. The attendance officer came. My mother told him I was pregnant. I wasn't but she thought that I could get a job and help out. I had jobs off and on but never long enough to learn anything. Mostly I remember being married. I was so young then. I am still young. For a time, we had all the things you have. There was a little house in another town, with hot water and everything. Then my husband lost his job. There was unemployment insurance for a while and what few jobs I could get. Soon all our nice things were repossessed and we moved back here. I was pregnant then. This house didn't look so bad when we first moved in. Every week it gets worse. Nothing is ever fixed. We now had no money. There were a few odd jobs for my husband, but everything went for food, then as it does now, I don't know how we lived through three years and three babies, but we did. I'll tell you something. After the last baby I destroyed my marriage. It had been a good one but could you keep on bringing children into this dirt? Did you ever think how much it costs for any kind of birth control? I knew my husband was leaving the day he left, but there were no good-byes between us. I hope he has been able to climb out of this mess somewhere. He

never could hope to with us to drag him down.

That's when I asked for help. When I got it, you know how much it was? It was, and is, \$78 a month for the four of us; that is all I ever can get. Now you know why there is no soap, no needles and thread, no hot water, no aspirin, no worm medicine, no hand cream, no shampoo. None of these things forever and ever and ever. So that you can see clearly, I pay \$20 a month rent, and most of the rest goes for food. For grits and cornmeal, and rice and beans. I try my best to use only the minimum electricity. If I use more, there is that much less for food.

Poverty is looking into a black future. Your children won't play with my boys. They will turn to other boys who will steal to get what they want. I can already see them behind the bars of their prison instead of behind the bars of my poverty. Or they will turn to the freedom of alcohol or drugs, and find themselves enslaved. And my daughter? At best, there is for her life like mine. It would be sensible of me to wish her dead.

But you say to me, there are schools. Yes, there are schools. My children have no extra books, no magazines, or extra pencils, or crayons, or paper and most important of all, they do not have health. They have worms, they have infections, they have pink-eye all summer. They do not sleep well on the floor, or with me in one bed. They do not suffer from hunger, my \$78 keeps us alive, but they do suffer from malnutrition.

Oh, yes, I do remember what I was taught about health in school. It doesn't do much good. In some places there is a surplus commodities program. Not here. The county said it cost too much. There is a school lunch program but I have two children who will already be damaged by the time they get to school.

But you say to me, there are health clinics. Yes, there are health clinics and they are in the towns. I live out here eight miles from town. I can walk that far (even if it is 16 miles both ways) but can my little children? My neighbor will take me in when he goes; but he expects to be paid, one way or another. I bet you know my neighbor. He is that large man who spends his time at the gas station, the barber shop, and the corner store complaining about the government spending money on the immoral mothers of illegitimate children.

Poverty is an acid that drips on pride until all pride is worn away. Poverty is a chisel that chips on honor until honor is worn away. Some of you say that you would do something in my situation and maybe you would, for the first week or the first month, but for year after year after year?

Even the poor can dream. A dream of time when there is money. Money for the right kinds of food, for worm medicine, for iron pills, for toothbrushes, for hand cream, for a hammer and nails and a bit of screening, for a shovel, for a bit of paint, for some sheeting, for needles and thread. Money to pay for a trip to town. And oh, money for hot water and money for soap. A dream of when asking for help does not eat away the last bit of pride. When the office you visit is as nice as the offices of other governmental agencies, when there are enough workers to help you quickly, when workers do not quit in defeat and despair. When you have to tell your story to only one person, and that person can send you for other help and you don't have to prove your poverty over and over again.

I have come out of my despair to tell you this. Remember I did not come from another place or another time. Others like me are all around you. Look at us with an angry heart, anger that will help you help me. Anger that will let you tell of me. The poor are always silent. Can you be silent too?

(Prepared-presented by: Jo Goodwin Parker, Christian Social Relations Committee United Church Women, West Volusia County, Deland, Florida.)

THE FOSTER GRANDPARENT PROGRAM

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Maryland [Mr. SICKLES] is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. SICKLES. Mr. Speaker, retirement has been considered by too many people as a time of idleness, and frankly, as a time of little productivity. But, we are waking up to the fact that our senior citizens are an untapped resource.

With our senior citizens living longer and in better health than the elderly of yesteryear, they are searching for ways to spend their time better. As a consequence, ways have been sought out to put retired persons to work. Medicare Alert was a good example of this effort. Green Thumb is another effort to find work for the elderly who want it, and at the same time reap advantages for the community from their efforts.

Still another way is through the foster grandparents program. Like the green thumb program, foster grandparents is sponsored by the war on poverty. Its purpose is to employ elderly persons living on modest incomes to be friends to deprived children, usually living in institutions, who are starved for companionship.

The program has four principal objectives:

First, it is designed to create new jobs for our older citizens.

Second, it is designed to provide new meaning to their lives and a sense of dignity.

Third, through this program, emotionally deprived children are given the affection and attention they so desperately need.

And fourth, the program is designed to demonstrate that there is a major new resource of responsible workers for communities and for social agencies.

To become a foster grandparent, a person must be over 60 years of age and living on a low income, the amount of which varies from area to area. He must also pass a complete medical examination. But the most important qualification for becoming a foster grandparent is that a person have a desire to help children who have been starved for love and affection all of their lives.

Institutions which qualify to use foster grandparents are orphanages, receiving homes, pediatric wards in general hospitals, and special long-term facilities for children suffering from congenital heart conditions, tuberculosis, and other physical or mental handicaps. But whatever the specialty of the institution it must be public or nonprofit.

In some cases, nonresidential institutions may use the services of foster grandparents. These would include child clinics, special classes, or sheltered workshops.

In order to achieve a close personal relationship between the foster grandparent and the child, the ratio of grandparents to children in any one institution

is 38 to 50. Thus, it is intended that the grandparent become a close and continuing friend of one or two children. In this relationship, the grandparent reads to the child, plays with him, takes him away from the institution into the community, accompanies him to contests or games, or is simply there when the child needs somebody to talk to.

The grandparent generally works 4 hours a day, devoting 2 hours of undivided attention to each of two children. The workweek is 5 days long, and on the other 2 days the regular grandparent is replaced by a substitute. If the regular grandparent is male, the substitute grandparent will be a female, and vice versa, thus providing the child with an environment more like a normal home setting. The substitute works 8 hours for each of the other 2 days in the week, spending 2 hours per day with each of four children.

The pay for a foster grandparent must be at least \$1.25 per hour, but it may be higher, depending on the institution and the community.

This is the type of program that can become so meaningful to a State like Maryland with a large number of elderly people who want and need additional work, and with a large community of children who need the love and care a foster grandparent can provide.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted to:

Mr. TENZER (at the request of Mr. MOSS), from 3 o'clock p.m. today until September 19, on account of religious observances.

Mr. DYAL, for September 16 through September 23, on account of official business.

Mr. MILLS, for the remainder of this week, on account of official business.

Mr. FALLON (at the request of Mr. WAGGONER), for today and tomorrow, on account of official business.

Mr. HELSTOSKI (at the request of Mr. BOGGS), for today and tomorrow, on account of official business.

SPECIAL ORDERS GRANTED

By unanimous consent, permission to address the House, following the legislative program and any special orders heretofore entered, was granted to:

The following Members (at the request of Mrs. REID of Illinois) and to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous matter:

Mr. DON H. CLAUSEN, for 1 hour, on September 20.

Mr. CONTE, for 15 minutes, today.

Mr. PELLY, for 30 minutes, today.

Mr. WYATT, for 15 minutes, today.

Mr. SICKLES (at the request of Mr. HOWARD) for 5 minutes today, to revise and extend his remarks, and include extraneous matter.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

By unanimous consent, permission to extend remarks in the CONGRESSIONAL

RECORD, or to revise and extend remarks was granted to:

Mr. SIKES, today in the Committee of the Whole, and to include extraneous material and tables, with his remarks made on H.R. 17637.

Mr. ULLMAN.

(The following Members (at the request of Mrs. REID of Illinois) and to include extraneous matter:)

Mr. ROBISON.

Mr. STANTON.

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. HOWARD) and to include extraneous matter:)

Mr. POWELL.

Mr. TENZER.

ENROLLED BILLS SIGNED

Mr. BURLESON, from the Committee on House Administration, reported that that committee had examined and found truly enrolled bills of the House of the following titles, which were thereupon signed by the Speaker:

H.R. 6686. An act to amend the Civil Service Retirement Act in order to correct an inequity in the application of such act with respect to the U.S. Botanic Garden, and for other purposes.

H.R. 11488. An act to authorize the grade of brigadier general in the Medical Service Corps of the Regular Army, and for other purposes; and

H.R. 13508. An act to direct the Secretary of Interior to cooperate with the States of New York and New Jersey on a program to develop, preserve, and restore the resources of the Hudson River and its shores and to authorize certain necessary steps to be taken to protect those resources from adverse Federal actions until the States and Congress shall have had an opportunity to act on that program.

SENATE ENROLLED BILLS SIGNED

The SPEAKER announced his signature to enrolled bills of the Senate of the following titles:

S. 3051. An act granting the consent of Congress to the compact between Missouri and Kansas creating the Kansas City Area Transportation District and the Kansas City Area Transportation Authority; and

S. 3625. An act to designate the dam being constructed on the Allegheny River, Pa., as the "Kinzua Dam," and the lake to be formed by such dam in Pennsylvania and New York as the "Allegheny Reservoir."

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. HOWARD. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 5 o'clock and 26 minutes p.m.) the House adjourned until tomorrow, Thursday, September 15, 1966, at 12 o'clock noon.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. COOLEY: Committee on Agriculture. H.R. 15662. A bill to amend the Federal Seed Act (53 Stat. 1275), as amended; with amend-

ments (Rept. No. 2042). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. HOLIFIELD: Joint Committee on Atomic Energy. H.R. 17685. A bill to amend the Atomic Energy Act of 1954, as amended (Rept. No. 2043). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 4 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. ASPINALL:

H.R. 17709. A bill to provide for the participation of the Department of the Interior in the construction and operation of a large prototype desalting plant, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. BURTON of California:

H.R. 17710. A bill to authorize the appropriation of additional funds necessary for acquisition of land at the Point Reyes National Seashore in California; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. FARNUM:

H.R. 17711. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to allow teachers to deduct from gross income the expenses incurred in pursuing courses for academic credit and degrees at institutions of higher education and including certain travel; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. GREIGG:

H.R. 17712. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to allow teachers to deduct from gross income the expenses incurred in pursuing courses for academic credit and degrees at institutions of higher education and including certain travel; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. HOWARD:

H.R. 17713. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to allow teachers to deduct from gross income the expenses incurred in pursuing courses for academic credit and degrees at institutions of higher education and including certain travel; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. LENNON:

H.R. 17714. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 with respect to the income tax treatment of business development corporations; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. McDOWELL:

H.R. 17715. A bill to amend section 203 of the Federal Property and Administrative Services Act of 1949 to permit the disposal of surplus personal property to State and local governments, and volunteer firefighting and rescue organizations at 50 percent of the estimated fair market value; to the Committee on Government Operations.

By Mr. WAGGONER:

H.R. 17716. A bill to amend title 10 of the United States Code so as to provide that the Chief of the Medical Service Corps of the Army, Navy, and Air Force shall be a brigadier general or rear admiral, as the case may be, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. CULVER:

H.R. 17717. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to allow teachers to deduct from gross income the expenses incurred in pursuing courses for academic credit and degrees at institutions of higher education and including certain travel; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. DYAL:

H.R. 17718. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to allow teachers to deduct from gross income the expenses incurred in pursuing courses for academic credit and degrees at institutions of higher

education and including certain travel; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. FRASER:

H.R. 17719. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to allow teachers to deduct from gross income the expenses incurred in pursuing courses for academic credit and degrees at institutions of higher education and including certain travel; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. ANDREWS of North Dakota:

H.R. 17720. A bill to amend title 18 of the United States Code to prohibit travel or use of any facility in interstate or foreign commerce with intent to incite a riot or other violent civil disturbance, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CABELL:

H.R. 17721. A bill to amend title 18 of the United States Code to prohibit travel or use of any facility in interstate or foreign commerce with intent to incite a riot or other violent civil disturbance, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CUNNINGHAM:

H.R. 17722. A bill to amend title 18 of the United States Code to prohibit travel or use of any facility in interstate or foreign commerce with intent to incite a riot or other violent civil disturbance, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. ERLÉNBERG:

H.R. 17723. A bill to amend title 18 of the United States Code to prohibit travel or use of any facility in interstate or foreign commerce with intent to incite a riot or other violent civil disturbance, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HARVEY of Indiana:

H.R. 17724. A bill to amend title 18 of the United States Code to prohibit travel or use of any facility in interstate or foreign commerce with intent to incite a riot or other violent civil disturbance, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HUTCHINSON:

H.R. 17725. A bill to amend title 18 of the United States Code to prohibit travel or use of any facility in interstate or foreign commerce with intent to incite a riot or other violent civil disturbance, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. JOHNSON of Pennsylvania:

H.R. 17726. A bill to amend title 18 of the United States Code to prohibit travel or use of any facility in interstate or foreign commerce with intent to incite a riot or other violent civil disturbance, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. KLUCZYNSKI:

H.R. 17727. A bill to amend title 18 of the United States Code to prohibit travel or use of any facility in interstate or foreign commerce with intent to incite a riot or other violent civil disturbance, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MINSHALL:

H.R. 17728. A bill to amend title 18 of the United States Code to prohibit travel or use of any facility in interstate or foreign commerce with intent to incite a riot or other violent civil disturbance, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mrs. REID of Illinois:

H.R. 17729. A bill to amend title 18 of the United States Code to prohibit travel or use of any facility in interstate or foreign commerce with intent to incite a riot or other violent civil disturbance, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SCOTT:

H.R. 17730. A bill to amend title 18 of the United States Code to prohibit travel or use of any facility in interstate or foreign commerce with intent to incite a riot or other violent civil disturbance, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SIKES:

H.R. 17731. A bill to amend title 18 of the United States Code to prohibit travel or use of any facility in interstate or foreign commerce with intent to incite a riot or other violent civil disturbance, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mrs. BOLTON:

H.R. 17732. A bill to amend title 18 of the United States Code to prohibit travel or use of any facility in interstate or foreign commerce with intent to incite a riot or other violent civil disturbance, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. FINDLEY:

H.R. 17733. A bill to amend title 18 of the United States Code to prohibit travel or use of any facility in interstate or foreign commerce with intent to incite a riot or other violent civil disturbance, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MARTIN of Alabama:

H.R. 17734. A bill to amend title 18 of the United States Code to prohibit travel or use of any facility in interstate or foreign commerce with intent to incite a riot or other violent civil disturbance, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. RONCALIO:

H.R. 17735. A bill to amend title 18 of the United States Code to prohibit travel or use of any facility in interstate or foreign commerce with intent to incite a riot or other violent civil disturbance, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CLARENCE J. BROWN, JR.:

H.R. 17736. A bill to amend section 1072 (2) (F) of title 10, United States Code, to include adoptive parents within the category of dependents eligible for medical care; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. CARTER:

H.R. 17737. A bill to provide Federal financial assistance to public agencies and to private, nonprofit organizations to enable them to carry on comprehensive family planning programs; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. GIBBONS:

H.R. 17738. A bill to authorize the establishment of the Biscayne National Monument in the State of Florida, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. KEITH:

H.R. 17739. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to encourage the construction of treatment works to control water pollution by permitting the deduction of expenditures for the construction, erection, installation, or acquisition of such treatment works; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. KUPFERMAN:

H.R. 17740. A bill to amend section 3 of the act of July 23, 1955 (ch. 375, 69 Stat. 368); to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. MOORE:

H.R. 17741. A bill relating to the appointment of the Director of the Federal Bureau of Investigation; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. RONCALIO:

H.R. 17742. A bill to prohibit desecration of the flag; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BOW:

H.R. 17743. A bill to amend title 18 of the United States Code to prohibit travel or use of any facility in interstate or foreign commerce with intent to incite a riot or other violent civil disturbance, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CALLAWAY:

H.R. 17744. A bill to amend title 18 of the United States Code to prohibit travel or use of any facility in interstate or foreign commerce with intent to incite a riot or other violent civil disturbance, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. DE LA GARZA:

H.R. 17745. A bill to authorize the Secretary of Agriculture to purchase certain land from Texas Southmost College, Brownsville, Tex.; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. DINGELL:

H.R. 17746. A bill to suspend, except for facilities to control air or water pollution, the investment credit and the allowances of accelerated depreciation in the case of certain real property; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. FOLEY:

H.R. 17747. A bill to establish a Small Tax Division within the Tax Court of the United States; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. HECHLER:

H.R. 17748. A bill to amend title 18 of the United States Code to prohibit travel or use of any facility in interstate or foreign commerce with intent to incite a riot or other violent civil disturbance, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. ROGERS of Florida:

H.R. 17749. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to allow teachers to deduct from gross income the expenses incurred in pursuing courses for academic credit and degrees at institutions of higher education and including certain travel; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. DYAL:

H.J. Res. 1303. Joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States granting to citizens of the United States who have attained the age of 18 the right to vote; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MEEDS:

H.J. Res. 1304. Joint resolution to authorize the President to issue annually a proclamation designating the 7-day period beginning October 2 and ending October 8 of each year as Spring Garden Planting Week; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BRADEMAM:

H. Con. Res. 1007. Concurrent resolution authorizing the printing of a report on "International Education" by the House Education and Labor Committee; to the Committee on House Administration.

By Mr. ANDERSON of Illinois:

H. Con. Res. 1008. Concurrent resolution expressing the sense of the Congress with respect to certain proposed regulations of the Food and Drug Administration relating to the labeling and content of diet foods and diet supplements; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. LAIRD:

H. Res. 1018. Resolution requesting the President for certain information regarding the 1967 budget; to the Committee on Appropriations.

By Mr. POWELL:

H. Res. 1019. Resolution to authorize the General Subcommittee on Labor of the Committee on Education and Labor to conduct an investigation and study of the operation of elementary and secondary schools by Federal agencies; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. COOLEY:

H. Res. 1020. Resolution to authorize the printing of additional hearings and other materials by the Committee on Agriculture; to the Committee on House Administration.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. CAHILL:

H.R. 17750. A bill for the relief of certain individuals; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. IRWIN:

H.R. 17751. A bill for the relief of Monika Keilholz; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. KEITH:

H.R. 17752. A bill for the relief of Jane Velsa Smith; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mrs. KELLY:

H.R. 17753. A bill for the relief of Wan Tao Liu; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. LENNON:

H.R. 17754. A bill for the relief of Tabor City Lumber Co. and Hennis Freight Lines; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. POWELL:

H.R. 17755. A bill for the relief of Patrick Sibbles; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

SENATE

WEDNESDAY, SEPTEMBER 14, 1966

(Legislative day of Wednesday, September 7, 1966)

The Senate met at 11 o'clock a.m., on the expiration of the recess, and was called to order by Hon. THOMAS H. KUCHEL, a Senator from the State of California.

Rev. C. Fred Williams, D.D., minister, Central Methodist Church, Arlington, Va., offered the following prayer:

Almighty God, our Heavenly Father, we are Thy people, seeking Thy favor and dependent upon Thy mercy. Our fathers trusted in Thee and were not put to shame. We would surpass their faith in this exciting day.

We are bound in the bundle of life, so that we rise or fall, suffer or rejoice as one.

The Nation and the world look to this body of chosen persons for leadership. May the awareness of this fact give strength, purpose, and compassion to their planning, and lend speed to their action in all undertakings of the common good.

Grant, O God, that the magnitude of the world task laid upon their shoulders may not blind them to the needs of the least, nor the cries of the neediest make them unmindful of the Nation and of the world.

We pray that the desire for Thy kingdom of righteousness may be greater than the demands of any party or class that clamors for a hearing at the expense of another.

Our prayers are offered for the President of this Nation. May he be a person of sharpened judgment, undeviating courage in behalf of the right, and inflexible integrity. May he continually look to Thee for daily strength, knowing that he is accountable to Thee, and to the people who have given him the high office which he holds.

These things we ask in the spirit of the Man of Galilee. Amen.

DESIGNATION OF ACTING PRESIDENT PRO TEMPORE

The legislative clerk read the following letter:

U.S. SENATE,
PRESIDENT PRO TEMPORE,
Washington, D.C., September 14, 1966.
To the Senate:

Being temporarily absent from the Senate, I appoint Hon. THOMAS H. KUCHEL, a Sena-

tor from the State of California, to perform the duties of the Chair during my absence.

CARL HAYDEN,
President pro tempore.

Mr. KUCHEL thereupon took the chair as Acting President pro tempore.

THE JOURNAL

On request of Mr. MANSFIELD, and by unanimous consent, the Journal of the proceedings of Tuesday, September 13, 1966, was approved.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate the following letters, which were referred as indicated:

REPORT ON SURVEY OF PROBLEMS OF SMALL BUSINESS DISPLACEMENT UNDER FEDERAL AND FEDERALLY ASSISTED PROGRAMS OF PUBLIC IMPROVEMENT

A letter from the Attorney General, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on a survey of the problems of small business displacement under Federal and federally assisted programs of public improvement (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

CONSTRUCTION AND OPERATION OF A DESALTING PLANT

A letter from the Secretary of the Interior, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to provide for the participation of the Department of the Interior in the construction and operation of a large prototype desalting plant, and for other purposes (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES

The following reports of committees were submitted:

By Mr. ROBERTSON, from the Committee on Banking and Currency, without amendment:

H.R. 14026. An act to provide for the more flexible regulation of maximum rates of interest or dividends payable by banks and certain other financial institutions on deposits or share accounts, to authorize higher reserve requirements on time deposits at member banks, to authorize open market operations in agency issues by the Federal Reserve banks, and for other purposes (Rept. No. 1601).

By Mr. JORDAN of North Carolina, from the Committee on Rules and Administration, without amendment:

S. 3809. A bill to authorize the Public Printer to print for and deliver to the General Services Administration an additional copy of certain publications (Rept. No. 1602).

By Mr. RANDOLPH, from the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare, without amendment:

H.R. 16367. An act to extend the benefits of the war orphans' educational assistance program to the children of those veterans of the Philippine Commonwealth Army who died or have become permanently and totally disabled by reason of their service during World War II, and for other purposes (Rept. No. 1604).

By Mr. RANDOLPH, from the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare, with an amendment:

H.R. 16330. An act to provide for extension and expansion of the program of grants-in-aid to the Republic of the Philippines for the